

Appendix

Teachers for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 22 and 23 the House Subcommittee on Special Education held hearings to consider legislation on aid to the handicapped. Among the bills considered was H.R. 7376, a bill to establish a special training program for teachers of the deaf. This important legislation would make available to deaf children specially trained teachers, and in addition would provide individuals suffering from speech and hearing impairments with specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists to help them overcome their handicap and live a richer, fuller life. I have always been deeply concerned with the problems of the deaf, and H.R. 7376 would make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

I have a very personal interest in this bill. The Maryland State School for the Deaf is located in my hometown of Frederick, Md. All of my life I have known members of the faculty and the students of the school. My father has been a member of the board of visitors for nearly 40 years. I have been familiar, therefore, with the problems of education of the deaf and with the potential for human progress that such training promises mankind. Many students of the Maryland School for the Deaf have remained in Frederick after graduation, and through the years they have been constructive citizens of the community.

I believe that H.R. 7376 is but a modest beginning to meet our country's increased demand to provide for the proper training of deaf children.

It is impossible to estimate the exact number of persons who require specially trained teachers in order to learn the art of simple communication. There are presently, however, over 26,500 students enrolled in classes for deaf persons, all of whom became deaf before they acquired language. A qualified teacher can enable these children to obtain various skills of communication due to the inherent ability of all children to learn. The amount of success obtained in teaching speech skills to these children is primarily dependent on the professional ability and training of the child's teacher. In 1954, the U.S. Office of Education reported that teachers of the deaf ranked first in "difficulty of securing" and there is no indication that this need has lessened.

A recent survey report by the Council of Education of the Deaf revealed the following:

School year	Teachers needed	Teachers in training graduated in the previous year	Shortage	Number of training centers	Number of training centers reporting no students
1958-59...	1 516	138	378	25	0
1959-60...	1 511	127	384	25	4
1960-61...	1 549	177	372	25	4
1961-62...	1 653	199	1 454	30	5

¹ Responses from 233 of the 380 schools and classes for the deaf in the United States.

² Responses from 269 of the 400 schools and classes for the deaf in the United States.

The following additional information was furnished also:

First. Although there are 199 teachers-in-training in all 30 of the training centers this year, those responding to the questionnaire indicated that they have been able to secure 290 trained teachers for next year. This would indicate that 91 trained teachers who have not been teaching this school year have been brought back to active status. Even at that there remains a shortage of 363 teachers for the school year beginning September 1961.

Second. Two hundred and eight schools and classes indicate that they expect to expand their programs during the next 5 years to accommodate more children; 46 indicated that they do not expect to expand and 15 were uncertain.

Third. Of the 208 schools and classes who indicated that they do expect to expand their program, they report that they will need 606½ additional teachers over and above their present teaching staff to take care of the expansion.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has estimated that 27,300 competent professional teachers are needed; 20,000 of these are needed to train children. To train our schoolchildren alone we need to provide 1,500 speech pathologists and audiologists each year for 10 years, and presently we are training less than 400 per year. These numbers include teachers of the deaf only and do not include personnel needed for research nor personnel needed to train the teacher.

This serious shortage of qualified teachers is due in part to a lack of adequate State programs. It seems at this time that a program of Federal assistance is vitally needed in order to provide deaf children with the opportunity to overcome their handicap.

H.R. 7376 provides for an annual payment of \$1.5 million for 2 years and such other sums as may be required for an additional 8 years for educational costs and scholarships for teachers of the deaf in nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

The bill also establishes a 10-year pro-

gram for educational costs and scholarships for speech pathologists and audiologists at institutions of higher education that provide the comprehensive training needed to train teachers for deaf children.

The bill is supported by the National Council on the Education of the Deaf. The council is made up of three organizations directly concerned with education of the deaf: The Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, the Conference on Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc.

In the neighborhood of the National Capital we have reason to be constantly aware of the great work being done in the education of the deaf. As I have said, the Maryland School for the Deaf is in nearby Frederick, Md. Gallaudet College is located in the District of Columbia. Both are adding many useful new citizens to our communities each year. In my long personal acquaintance with the Maryland School for the Deaf and with its superintendent, Mr. Lloyd A. Ambrosen, I have been consistently impressed with the fine record of accomplishment at this school. Such records of public service could be multiplied and improved throughout the country by passage of H.R. 7376 and I sincerely hope that the House will have an opportunity to approve this vital legislation.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Berlin—Why Wait for Mr. K.?" published in the July 14, 1961, issue of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN—WHY WAIT FOR MR. K.—THE WEST CAN HAVE A GREAT ISSUE IN EASTERN EUROPE, BUT ONLY IF WE WILL WAGE REAL POLITICAL WARFARE

This is a summer of foreboding in the West. Not since 1939 has that grisly pre-war feeling run so strong. There is even a fatalistic readiness—among three Americans in five, according to Reporter Samuel Lubell—to use nuclear weapons if need be. And all because Khrushchev has set another deadline (December 31) for a showdown on the free city of Berlin.

President Kennedy could ameliorate this grim atmosphere by a positive line of action. It would, in our opinion, greatly reduce the

chances of war over Berlin; or if worst comes to worst, it would put us in a better position to win such a war. Instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline, Kennedy should set an earlier one of his own. Since Khrushchev has seen fit to raise the Berlin question, why should not Kennedy insist on the right of East Germans to self-determination in free elections, as promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955? And on the similar rights of Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians, not to mention the Baltic peoples?—rights spelled out in treaties that have been systematically violated by Russia since the war. Kennedy recently gave verbal support to the East German rights and they are doubtless mentioned in the Allied replies to Khrushchev this week. What we suggest is that Kennedy now make a cause of self-determination for all Eastern Europe and back it with certain actions that could make Khrushchev sorry he ever opened the subject of Berlin.

Militarily, Berlin is an exposed and highly vulnerable Western salient surrounded by 400,000 Russian troops. Politically, however, it is a Western asset and a Communist liability. It symbolizes the chief weakness of Soviet power, which is the unquenched desire for freedom of 100 million captive Europeans. They have demonstrated this desire by heroic revolts and by fleeing westward by the millions ever since World War II. East Germany alone continues to lose 4,500 refugees a week. A food shortage coupled with the threat to their escape hatch has just caused fresh demonstrations by East German workers; some experts predict another revolt. Eastern Europe's hatred of communism is so great a political liability to Khrushchev that it amounts to a military weakness as well. If there were war of any kind over Berlin, "the Russian rear [as Dean Acheson put it] could be in turmoil overnight."

In view of this weakness, it is preposterous that Khrushchev should be allowed to get away with demands in Germany. His very belligerence is probably defensive. The West's passive and strictly defensive show of fortitude about Berlin is also somewhat incongruous. Berlin is not our Thermopylae; it is an opening to the heart of captive Europe, with which its cause is inextricably linked. The freedom of Europe was earned in blood (one-third of East Germany was held by American troops in 1945) and sealed in solemn treaties. Khrushchev should be summoned to a conference not about Berlin, but about the reunification of Germany with free elections under Big Four supervision; and about self-determination, free elections, free press, etc. in Eastern Europe as well.

When he refuses, the West has several recourses to make him change his mind. They are not mere words and do not have to be shouted; they are acts of political warfare, the kind of warfare he has so long conducted against us.

One is economic sanctions. This could mean anything from a complete embargo on East-West trade to an undeclared but systematic sabotage of Western deliveries behind the Iron Curtain. The East bloc is much more dependent on this growing trade than the West. West German steel and ships, factories from Britain, grain from the United States are other items whose stoppage would hurt the Communist economies.

Such measures might antagonize pro-Western opinion behind the curtain. But this could be at least neutralized by a radical step-up in the way the West explains its aims and policies to the captive nations. The Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, RIAS and other organs of propaganda could be remobilized. The captive nations theme, soft-pedaled of late, has proved its ability to enrage Khrushchev. Although

RFE did not foment the Hungarian revolt, it has the power to stir up almost any degree of unrest that may suit our purposes. The chief problem is to say no more and no less than we are prepared to support with action.

The third major ingredient in political warfare is active military preparedness. (Khrushchev himself last week canceled proposed reductions in Russia's armed forces and upped his military budget by \$3.5 billion.) Kennedy and his advisers are now deeply engaged in contingency planning to prove our resolve to defend Berlin. But if he enlarges his cause to the whole Eastern theater, the military planning should be enlarged too. We could take various emergency steps, and the NATO command could move to a higher state of readiness. In appropriate combination and without fanfare, such acts would give Khrushchev the right message.

It may be objected that political warfare of this kind is out of character for the Western democracies, or even impossible for an alliance of unequally resolute states. But that, surely, has been the trouble with Western policy: its divided and nerveless reluctance to answer Khrushchev's political warfare with our own. Only strong Washington leadership can change this state of affairs. On the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt last month, Leo Cherne remarked: "If freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact, those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom [i.e., Europeans] are permitted to remain slaves."

This doubtless sounds like that old proposition called roll-back or liberation, which was gradually shelved as too risky in a nuclear age. Its opponents say it confronts the Communists with intolerable choices, like cornering a tiger. But since we face the risk of war for Berlin in any case, why not be smart about it as well as brave? Said Mayor Willy Brandt, "In negotiations, if you want to keep what you have, you must ask for more than you have."

There is no solution to the Berlin problem (except Khrushchev's solution) if it is isolated from the problem of the Germanys and Eastern Europe, the unfinished business of World War II. For the West to embrace this larger issue, controlling its course and timing, would put Berlin in a truer perspective. It would tear the mask from Khrushchev's absurd bellicosity on his weakest front. It would rescue our own Berlin policy from the trap of mere nuclear fortitude. It would put that policy back in touch with the great hopes we nurtured, and the obligations we assumed, only yesterday. In Eastern Europe, their memory is still green.

"Ode to the Statue of Liberty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was recently honored by a visit from an old friend of mine from Alanreed, Tex. Alanreed is located on Highway 66 in the southern part of Gray County, Tex. Just north of Alanreed my good friend, Paul M. Bruce, has long maintained a nursery. He has dedicated his

life to the soil and the things that God makes to grow. His wonderful work is well known throughout the Panhandle of Texas and the southwest.

In recent months, he came to New York to visit his brother and decided to come by the Nation's Capital for a visit. While so doing, he struck up a conversation with a gentleman by the name of Johnny Walker of Scranton, Pa. Mr. Walker very kindly brought him by my office, as he was well acquainted and familiar with Washington.

Subsequently, Mr. Bruce wrote to Johnny Walker thanking him for his courtesies and enclosing in that letter his thoughts as he viewed the Statue of Liberty. Mr. Walker was so deeply impressed with these two documents that he forwarded them to his Congressman, the Honorable WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, of the 10th District of Pennsylvania. Congressman SCRANTON very kindly forwarded these documents to me, and I am taking the liberty of inserting them in the RECORD. I think that the statements of Paul M. Bruce, of Alanreed, Tex., should be read by every American, and I hope that this will be possible. The letter from Mr. Bruce I insert first and his "Ode to the Statue of Liberty" immediately following:

AUGUST 12, 1961.

DEAR JOHNNY WALKER: I don't have words to express my thanks to you for being so very nice to me in the District of Columbia.

My Representative, WALTER ROGERS, was wonderful, also seeing that I was well cared for while in the District of Columbia. I saw many beautiful sights. God has made us a wonderful nation. When I left WALTER's office, I was just a little lost. A very nice lady started past me. She said, "Aren't you a little lost here in the District of Columbia? I might help you." "Sure," I said. "I would like to get out in the open." She was from New Mexico. I never have had so many wonderful experiences in all my life. Every time I needed help, someone was right there to help the Texan. I hope I can be helpful to others as they were to me.

I am enclosing my version of the Statue of Liberty as I promised.

I will never forget how nice you were to me.

I wish you success in your every endeavor. Best wishes always,

Love,

PAUL M. BRUCE.

ODE TO STATUE OF LIBERTY

(By Paul Bruce, Alanreed, Tex.)

I fell in love with her—the Statue of Liberty.

We boarded a helicopter at Idlewild Airport near New York City. It was a beautiful evening. A fine old gentleman sat beside me. He was born in New York City and he began to tell me about the different beautiful sights. "I hope the pilot flies us by the Statue of Liberty." "Wonderful," I said. We could see her at a distance. The pilot headed our plane directly toward her; we passed just above and to my side. I was next to the window as we faced her. She is the most beautiful statue I have ever seen. Standing there in the harbor, facing the ocean, calm, beautiful, poised and serene. That's when I fell in love with her. I waved my hand and blew a kiss to her. Something was telling me she understood. It all happened so quickly, she didn't have time to wave or smile back at me. Then I began to realize what she really meant to me—liberty, freedom, love, and the pursuit of happiness. In fact, everything, all the virtues of life.

Man has no greater gifts than these except eternal life in heaven with his Maker. She stands there in the harbor, facing the ocean, to welcome the weary traveler on his long voyage home across the deep blue sea, or the one seeking a new home on her beautiful and peaceful shores.

We pray to our God in whom we trust, that she will always remain there, beautiful, serene and unmatched, as she stands today and that the peoples of the world will fall in love with her as I have. Please do.

I am wondering if all who have gazed upon her lovely face fully realize what she means to them and what she stands for—let's not forget. We are truly indebted to all who had a part in erecting this beautiful Statue of Liberty. I pray that all who view her or learn of her wonderful ways will fall in love with her as I have. Although I live many miles from her, I will always love her and cherish the memory of her. Won't you?

Everyone in the United States of America that's old enough has heard about her. She is cherished and loved by millions, and not enough millions have looked into her beautiful face—still not enough. You should see her. To see her is to appreciate her more.

Her name is Liberty because she stands for every principle that we know as a free, liberty loving people and Nation. We should do our very best to live the principles of life she stands for. Liberty has cost us much since the birth of our Nation. Let's be brave and not cowards. Let's preserve it, love and keep it. God gave it to us because he loved us.

Let's love and trust Him more. He is the giver of all our blessings. Won't you love Him more? Let Him be your first love.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on August 21, the Czechoslovak National Council of America sent a letter to the President concerning the Berlin crisis. In this note the council praised the President's firm stand and suggested several constructive proposals regarding the captive nations of Europe.

I believe these suggestions deserve consideration, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., August 21, 1961.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: Speaking to the Nation on July 25, 1961, you asked your fellow Americans for their support of the Nation's new and more vigorous policies and for their suggestions, as well, of ways which might possibly better serve our common purposes.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, speaking in behalf of thousands of American citizens of Czechoslovak descent, in response to your appeal, is happy to assure you of the loyal support of the entire

membership and to submit respectfully the following suggestions:

Let it be clear that we are in full agreement with the general outline of your new policy, preeminently with that part of it which might be summarized by a single sentence: No more appeasement.

Please rest assured that of all your fellow citizens, no supporters of this principle are more ardent than we whose memory of the tragedy of the Munich agreement is permanently alive.

Our spontaneous support is also dictated by our conviction that had the West been able some 13 or 15 years ago to muster the courage, vigor, and decision which we find in your recent proclamation, Czechoslovakia would not be a Communist-dominated country today.

Let it also be understood that even though the issue in this present crisis is not the freedom of the Czechoslovak people, but rather the freedom of their recent adversaries, we nonetheless welcome with a sigh of relief this belated official recognition of the fact that firmness is the only advisable course of action in relation to world communism.

At the same time that we voice our support of the new policy, we feel compelled to submit respectfully for your consideration the following comments in margin to your recent statement.

Just as we sincerely welcome what has been said, we nonetheless deeply regret that we did not find in your text that which, in our judgment, should also have been said: a more specific reference to the problems of the captive European nations.

Just as we fully agree that a divided Berlin cannot be usefully discussed without a discussion of a divided Germany, so we believe that a divided Germany cannot be discussed without reference to a wider context: a divided Europe. The division of Berlin and Germany is most certainly unnatural, unjust and dangerous. We think it would have been appropriate to state at this time that the division of Europe is unnatural, unjust and dangerous on an even larger scale.

These are the reasons why we think that such a widening of the scope of your speech would have been advisable:

Your speech, Mr. President, centers on the defense of legal rights, acquired on the part of the United States by the Potsdam agreement and subsequent agreements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Your statement carefully avoids any topic which might be misconstrued as a threat to the security of the Soviet Union in East and Central Europe.

It is our considered opinion: first, that the very concept of such a threat is an anachronism and secondly, that we, the people of the United States, as represented by our Chief Executive, have an equal right and obligation to discuss with the Soviet Union the problems of the captive European nations, just as we have the right and obligation to defend our unfettered presence in Berlin.

The inclusion of the captive nations problems would provide a wider basis to our diplomatic initiative; it would not necessarily alienate our major allies, nor preclude any further fruitful negotiation with the Soviet Union; nor could it be—in good faith—misrepresented as an interference in matters which are no concern of ours. We hold, indeed, that the status quo of the captive nations is eminently our concern.

Our right and obligation to insist on a discussion of the captive nations of Europe is based on both moral and legal considerations, as indicated by the needs of our own security:

(a) It is generally accepted as true—and you, Mr. President, have contributed some of the most eloquent statements to this effect—that America's historic mission is to

help bring freedom and justice to all the people of the world over that wish to be free and that are able to establish the rule of law under governments of their own free choice.

There is no place for doubt that the captive nations are such a people.

(b) Both the United States of America and the Soviet Union are among the signatories of internationally binding instruments, unilaterally violated, however, by the Soviet Union. This fact gives us a right and imposes upon us a duty to protest.

The Atlantic Charter stipulates that freedom and independence be restored to the nations which had been deprived of them and that territorial changes be made only with the consent of the people concerned. These principles are overtly violated by the Soviet Union, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union endorsed the principles of the Atlantic Charter, as stated in the preamble of the United Nations Joint Declaration of January 1, 1942.

The indirect Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia, which resulted in the Communist domination of that country, is still, 13 years later, an unsolved item on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council. Numerous other aspects of the ensuing relationship of the Soviet Union toward Czechoslovakia and the other satellite nations (above all, the suppression of the Hungarian revolt) constitute many violations of the United Nations Charter.

A long list of instances might be cited of Soviet violations of bilateral or multilateral agreements bearing the signatures of the Soviet Union and the United States of America throughout its satellite empire.

Hence there can be no doubt of our right and duty to protest.

(c) An enlightened self-interest seems to indicate that our security in war and peace shall better be protected if the people of the captive nations continue to be our silent friends in the future. In Czechoslovakia this can best be achieved by providing proof that the present Communist propaganda line is a lie.

This dangerously effective Communist propaganda claims that the United States is no longer interested in the liberation of the captive nations; that it has, in fact, virtually written them off and is interested only in the fate of the Germans; that any future success of American designs in Central and Eastern Europe would necessarily lead—in the case of Poland—to the loss of newly acquired territories east of the Oder-Nisse Rivers, and—in the case of Czechoslovakia—to a forced repatriation en masse of the Sudeten Germans which, in turn, would necessarily result in a repetition of the gruesome experience of 1938-45.

So much for Communist propaganda.

Mr. K.'s answer over the Captive Nations Week resolution, as displayed on the occasion of his conversation with Mr. Nixon, and the measures undertaken by the government of Czechoslovakia, prohibiting the delivery of mail bearing the U.S. "Masaryk" postage stamp, seem to prove sufficiently how very anxious the Communists are to withhold from the captive people any evidence of American interest in their freedom and independence.

We regretfully voice our anxiety lest the absence in your speech of any explicit reference to the captive nations be misused by the Communists in support of their vicious propaganda; lest it adversely influence the existing silent friendship of the captive people and thereby indirectly lower the degree of our future security.

We know, Mr. President, that this could not have been your intention.

The above mentioned considerations of moral and legal character, as well as the dictates of political realism and expediency, prompt us to formulate the following suggestions:

That in any future policy statement concerning East-West relations and in any future top level negotiations with the Soviet Union, explicit reference be made to the unsatisfactory state of affairs existing throughout the captive European nations.

Among the numerous points on which we should rightfully insist, by far the most important are the following two:

1. The withdrawal of all Soviet organs of control from the satellite nations;
2. The holding of free elections under effective international control.

In wishful anticipation of pacific developments in Germany, we might add a further desideratum:

3. If and when a peace conference with a united Germany would be held, the U.S. Government should insist on the presence at the conference table of those who have a better right to represent the true interests of Poland and Czechoslovakia than the present puppet governments, imposed by Moscow.

We wish to avail ourselves of this occasion, Mr. President, to assure you of our deepest gratitude for the spark of hope that you have been able to kindle through your vigor and leadership in the hearts of the people now living under the yoke of Communism.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF AMERICA,
EMILIE WELCH,

ANDREW VALUSEK, *Secretary,*

FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG, *President,*

Chairman, Political Committee,

VLASTA VRAZ, *Executive Vice President.*

Drug Antitrust Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the concern that has been registered with Congress relative to the sale of drugs and recent proposals such as the Drug Industry Antitrust Act, I think the following letter received from Mr. Ted Rowell, Jr., vice president of Rowell Laboratories, Inc., of Baudette, Minn., would be of interest to every Member:

DEAR MR. LANGEN: We are deeply concerned with the effect that the passage of the Celler bill (H.R. 6245) will have not only on the pharmaceutical industry in general, but most especially on the small ethical pharmaceutical manufacturer.

We, as a representative of the smaller pharmaceutical manufacturers, know that to effectively compete with the major companies in our field with growth and increased research activities we must have an advantage over our larger competitors. We cannot be satisfied with products that are similar to theirs nor those which are the same as theirs that we would receive through licensing agreements. We must strive for products that are better. We must be able to retain this advantage which can only be done through the patent system.

The American patent law is generally recognized as perhaps the single most important legal spur to the growth of small production businesses into larger ones. It assures the inventive individual or company a temporary advantage in competition.

Many small companies have become great corporations because their inventiveness has been rewarded by patent protection.

Under the proposed legislation the patent owner would be required to issue a license to any applicant, and he would also be required to disclose all his currently confidential research information about the product or process. In short, this provision would command the inventor to divulge the knowledge necessary to put a competitor into business. This competitor would have an advantage in that he did not incur expenses to gain this know-how and immediately puts him at price advantage. For this reason total patent costs must be spread over a period of 3 years rather than 17 years. Cuts the price of drugs?

This legislation attempts, in effect, to cancel out or to water down the constitutional right of an inventor to benefit from his own genius. Legal experts believe that, while this will most seriously and immediately hurt the individual scientist and the small company in the drug industry, its overall effect will be to impede progress in medicine, and increase costs to the detriment of mankind.

The very idea that a company must have a license from the Federal Government to go into business or to stay in business is certainly undesirable as it gives one person or one group of people the right to say whether or not we can be in business. For this reason alone this section of the proposed legislation is not only undesirable but unjust.

We are dedicated to the public health and strongly desire to step up the research program to seek out and make improvements in medication. While this desire is strong, it can be killed without the stimulus and rewards of our free enterprise system.

This is well borne out by a study of Western countries by Prof. Jesse Markham, of Princeton University, wherein he found a high correlation between drug studies and patent protection. Professor Markham also wrote that the 42 important ethical drugs discovered in foreign countries were discovered largely in countries which afford reasonable, adequate patent incentive.

It is our philosophy that the American people should be provided with the finest medication available at the lowest possible cost. Any legislation that would be an instrument to this end would most certainly win our support.

This legislation which is now proposed would bring about the opposite effect. Therefore, we ask that you oppose this legislation with every device available to you.

Sincerely,

ROWELL LABORATORIES,
TED ROWELL, Jr.,

Vice President.

P.S.—The fact still remains that people spend more for either tobacco, alcohol or cosmetics than they do for drugs.

Macon Moose Lodge Undertakes Polio Shot Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the city of Macon, Ga., Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose has undertaken as a project of community service a survey to determine how many citizens have had their antipolio vaccine shots.

Under the direction of Lodge Gov. J. H. Waits, Jr., the survey has as its purpose the determination of how many Macon residents have not been immunized against infantile paralysis. It is a followup to a Moose project of 3 years ago in making Salk vaccine available to all in Macon desiring it, and the data thus developed will become the basis of a drive to persuade those not yet vaccinated to obtain their shots. This is an excellent example of constructive public service which deserves the commendation and emulation of all Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and two editorials about this project which appeared in the Macon papers.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Macon News, August 19, 1961]

SURVEY OF NEED FOR POLIO SHOTS IS SCHEDULED

Plans for a communitywide polio shot survey were announced today by J. H. Waits, Jr., governor of Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose.

The purpose of the project, under the direction of the civic affairs committee, is to find every man, woman, and child in Bibb County who has not had polio vaccine and to then attempt to persuade them to obtain the protection. Waits said.

The fraternal organization's more than 2,500 members are each being asked to contact at least 20 other families and to obtain relative information. Data will also be obtained on how many children under 19 years of age have birth defects or rheumatoid arthritis through the survey.

The Moose Lodge 3 years ago conducted a highly successful campaign to make available polio shots to all who needed them, but Waits said it is known that there are still a number of people in the community who have not had the vaccine, and for the protection of all citizens all persons should have the shots.

Ralph Jones, chairman of the Macon Chapter of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, urged cooperation of all citizens as well as Moose members in the project and said that if it is successful it would be a big step forward in public health.

Local medical and public health officials are expected to endorse the community survey.

Moose members were mailed forms to be filled out and returned by October 1. The forms list members of families by age and specify whether or not polio shots have been administered.

Waits said the Macon lodge has won national recognition for community service in the past and that the present project was but another effort by the organization to continue its record of public service.

[From the Macon Telegraph, Aug. 21, 1961]

MOOSE ADOPT VALUABLE PROJECT

Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose, which won first place in the fraternal organization's national competition for community service last year, is continuing its fine record of interest in civic affairs in the current polio shot survey.

Three years ago the Moose helped to set up stations to administer polio vaccine shots to all who needed them. The response was tremendous. But it is known that there are a number of Bibb Countians, grownups as well as children, who have not been afforded such protection. The idea of the campaign announced by the Moose organization is to find out who are those who have not had

shots and where they live, and to urge them to obtain the vaccine.

This is public health service of the highest order. The polio virus knows no race, creed, or color. It does not differentiate between rich and poor. It does not recognize political boundary lines. The crippling killer may strike anywhere. But the more people who are immunized against polio the less likely it is that there will be any cases, much less a serious outbreak.

[From the Macon News, Aug. 21, 1961]

POLIO SHOT SURVEY

"Have you had your Salk antipolio vaccine shots? If so, how many and when?" These are some of the questions being asked by members of Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose as those in the fraternal organization cooperate in a communitywide polio shot survey.

Dr. Donald Henderson, of the U.S. Communicable Diseases Center in Atlanta, says polio may be on the defensive, but it is too early to say that it is beaten. He terms the next few weeks critical ones in the fight against infantile paralysis.

What a relief it would be of polio could be completely knocked out, if the dread threat of the crippling killer striking in any family could be removed from the worried minds of fathers and mothers. That is the aim of the Moose who are seeking to find out who has not been immunized, and to persuade them to obtain polio shots. In addition, information on birth defects and rheumatoid arthritis will be gathered in the survey.

Moose members are each being asked to contact 20 other families and obtain valid information. This is a worthwhile project deserving of the cooperation of all citizens. Three years ago the Moose did a splendid job in making Salk vaccine available to all who would show up to receive it. The current survey is in that great tradition of community service.

Hon. Paul J. Kilday, Speech Before VFW Convention, Miami, Fla., August 24, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant and thought-stimulating address was delivered by the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Miami, Fla., on August 24, 1961.

In the very near future, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY will leave the Congress of the United States to assume his judicial role as a Judge of the Court of Military Appeals. The loss to the Congress is inestimable, but the gain to the Court of Military Appeals is beyond measure.

The advice contained in the address of the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY is eminently sound. I commend his remarks to all who concern themselves about the future of our national security:

ADDRESS OF PAUL J. KILDAY BEFORE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AUGUST 24, 1961

National Commander Connell, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentleman.

For me to be here with you on this occasion is in itself a most rewarding experience, but to be here as the recipient of an award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars is an honor beyond anything that I might have hoped could befall me. I am sincerely humble and grateful.

But it would be less than candid of me if I did not say that this award is undoubtedly the result of fortuitous circumstances over which I had no control.

It is due to the fact that when I first came to the Congress of the United States, I was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee, and the additional fact that the Congress utilizes the much criticized seniority system, which always seems to become more plausible and reasonable as a Member's seniority increases.

In those troublesome times when I first came to Congress, which seem hazy today by comparison, San Antonio, Tex., was a relatively quiet part of the great southwest, dedicated primarily to the Army Air Corps, Fort Sam Houston, and an Army hospital.

But, I am sure it was the proximity of those military installations and not any particular talent displayed by me, that determined my being assigned to the Military Affairs Committee.

I say this because my service in the Congress thereafter, from 1939 to date, while not exclusively dedicated to the uniformed services and particularly to the men and women who compose our armed services, at least has accounted for more than a major share of the attention I have given to legislative matters. Thus, you honor me today far beyond anything that I deserve for circumstances beyond my control and for my having merely performed my congressional duties in a way that I hoped would reflect some credit upon my district, and at least keep me from being held in disdain by my constituents. Regardless of the reason, I sincerely appreciate the honor.

Thus, it is with great and, I hope, understandable pride that I accept this award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Your organization has continuously adhered to traditions in which you can all take personal pride. You have never vacillated.

Throughout your history you have stood fast for a sound and adequate national defense and a consistent, strong and stable force. Among other things you have an unchanging record of support for civilian control of the armed services and the maintenance of the great and time-tested Joint Chiefs of Staff concept.

It is my firm conviction that these principles of military organization constitute the proper military posture for our country.

Thus, I can say, with great sincerity, that your support has been and, I am convinced, will continue to be, a source of substantial strength to our national security and to the men and women who constitute our Armed Forces.

I am now in the position of completing my congressional career in order to begin a judicial career. It is, I suppose, somewhat paradoxical that one part of my public service must end in order that another may begin.

This also puts me in a painful dilemma for I leave a life which I have enjoyed more each year. Among other things, it has been a life in which I have had daily association with the finest men and women America produces—the men and women who serve or have served in our Armed Forces.

Now, I shall enter a new life, that of the jurist who will be exposed for the most part, I presume, to those who have run afoul of military law. These will, I suppose, consist of the misfits, or at least the misguided and the unfortunates who constitute such a very small minority of our armed services.

But in this Nation of ours, the great and the small, the important and the unimportant,

the general and the private, the corporal and the colonel, the wrongdoer and the do-gooder, the misfit and the suited, the wise and the foolish, all are equal in the eyes of the law.

And, in order to insure that this philosophy of our way of life is carried into military justice, the Congress of the United States saw fit to write into law the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I must confess that when I participated in the writing of the law, I never envisioned that I might be called upon at some future date to participate in construing various provisions of that code.

Nevertheless, now I am about to embark on a new career dedicated to the proposal the justice does not cease for any American when he enters the armed services.

I enter a career dedicated to the proposition that, while a military organization must of necessity function differently than ordinary civilian pursuits, nevertheless, certain fundamental concepts of justice are preserved and must prevail in America, even in a military organization.

But I shall not further bore you with my rambling observations on the career in which I am about to embark. Instead, I would like to briefly pass on to you my observations about the structure of the military organization with which I have been dealing for the past 21 years.

When I was elected to the Congress of the United States in 1938, we had an Army of 185,488. This, of course, included the Air Corps. We had a Navy of 119,088, and a Marine Corps of 18,356.

One year later, in 1939, the Army had only increased to 189,000; the Navy to 125,000, and the Marine Corps to 19,000.

In addition, I have seen the strength of our Armed Forces fluctuate from an Army of 8,267,000 in June 1945, to an Army of 554,000, in June of 1948.

I have seen our Navy go from 3,380,000, in 1945, to 381,000, in 1950. I have seen our Marine Corps go from 475,000, in 1944, to 74,279, in 1950.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, on the floor of the House on Monday, July 31, stated, in commenting on the history of the peaks and valleys of our military strength, that "they looked like a profile of the Rocky Mountains."

I, too, have watched this roller coaster defense planning go on for more than 20 years.

And I shall always feel that the greatest disservice we can render the American people is to lull them into complacency when we decrease the size of our Armed Forces. For 20 years, this type of action has inevitably resulted in crash programs to hastily mobilize or recapture the ground we have lost as the result of these unwise and overly optimistic reductions. Traditionally, we have maintained fewer forces than those that were actually required for our national security on a long-term basis.

Now, we have started again on a strength increase to build up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and, by previous planning, the Marine Corps. It is not a substantial increase compared with some of those that have occurred in the past, but it could well become most significant.

It is an increase which will add muscle and sinew to a body that already is composed of great strength.

For, notwithstanding our shortcomings, I do not share the unwarranted belief of a few that we are weak, or not strong enough to defend ourselves. I am convinced that we do possess tremendous military might.

We do possess a military might with the unquestioned capability of wreaking vast destruction. But it still lacks the capacity to apply small tourniquets in those cases where the bleeding is steady, but not spurting.

The President's latest recommendations for adding to the strength of our Armed Forces will give us an increased strength in versatility which has been, I am afraid, somewhat neglected over the past few years.

The men that will be provided will give the Army 14 full-strength combat divisions.

The new program will increase the Navy's amphibious lift capabilities and improve its antisubmarine warfare capability. It will put the Air Force in a far stronger position than it might otherwise have been in, had the original planned strengths continued unchanged.

But military strength by itself does not win or prevent wars.

Military strength is only as good as the man behind the weapon, and the man behind the weapon is entitled to the best that can be obtained.

This means that we must have not only highly trained men, but also modern equipment.

Simply having bodies in uniform, armed with World War II equipment, will not help solve the problems that face us now and in the future.

Today's soldier, sailor, airman, or marine must be more than the totter of a musket.

He must have the attributes of a minute-man and the courage of a member of Pickett's Brigade. He must also have a versatility superior to that of the enemy he is fighting.

He must know the guerrilla tactics of the rice paddies and the jungle; he must know how to overcome the effects of cold weather on his weapons.

He must understand the effects of nuclear blasts, the urgency of dispersal, the indispensability of mobility, and the power of concentrated fire.

In short, it is not enough that the serviceman of today be a jack-of-all-trades, he must be a master of his profession.

And while I do not suggest to you that we maintain an armed strength beyond our economic power, I do contend that we must agree upon a force structure that contains the capability of fighting both a nuclear and nonnuclear war, and that also contains the equipment to bring the right amount of force upon a given area at the right time.

This means airlift, sealift, Strac forces, Marine Corps readiness, SAC alerts, early warning systems, Polaris submarines, hunter-killer type submarines, antisubmarine warfare weapons, fighter bombers, interceptors, M-14 rifles, modern tanks, modern machineguns, improvements in bacteriological warfare, the ability to engage in a chemical war, and the courage of our convictions that these will all be produced in quantity, and quality, now and for the foreseeable future, until such time as mankind, by ironclad voluntary agreement, can decide for itself whether the fate of the world will be that of peace or extinction.

Our ability to exert this influence, this pressure, and this power, no matter where it may be required, means a force structure of sufficient size and sufficient capability to do a variety of jobs in various parts of the world at different times.

It is my opinion that the strength to which we are now building will improve this capability substantially, if it is attained and sustained.

But let us not again succumb to the otherwise inevitable consequence that this temporary solution will later permit a reduction in force.

So far as I am concerned, a reduction in force following this buildup would be the most dangerous single step we could take toward weakening our position in world affairs.

And let us not lull ourselves into a false sense of security that we can depend upon our mothballed ships to provide us with a constant sealift. We are soon going to have

to pay the price of a modern sealift, for we can no longer depend upon those seagoing inanimate veterans of World War II to meet the present requirements of modern sea power.

And just as we must improve our sealift with modern ships, so must we continue to improve our airlift.

Just as we are producing new rifles for our Army, so must we produce new and improved tanks, new and improved personnel carriers, and a multitude of other modern equipment to equal to the occasion of the present and the future. We must wean ourselves away from dependence upon the weapons of yesteryear to do the job of the future.

These are problems that lie ahead for our armed services and for the greatest legislative body in the history of mankind, the Congress of the United States.

I am leaving these matters to take on the more restricted problem of military justice, but I console myself with the thought that we, in America, can still devote ourselves to the welfare of the individual.

It is the attention we Americans pay to the individual that makes us so different from those who adhere to the concepts of communism.

It is this dedication to a concern for the individual that not only sets us apart from communism, but will, in the long run, result in victory for the free world—so long as we are willing to make the same sacrifice in time and wealth, that we have willingly made in the past, to preserve our freedom.

Sacrifice, of course, means different things to different people. But some degree or type of sacrifice is required by all of us if we are to win this long and constant struggle.

For some, it means a sacrifice of time, for others, a sacrifice of opportunity. For others a sacrifice of money, and for others, perhaps even the supreme sacrifice. But I am thoroughly convinced that the only way we will be able to match a dedicated opponent is to equal or surpass his dedication.

And, if I may be permitted, let me close by passing on to you an excerpt from a speech made by John Curran in 1790:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequences of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

If we will not make those sacrifices of time, opportunity, money, and blood to preserve that freedom which we now possess, then servitude most assuredly will be the inevitable consequence. But I have a great and abiding faith in the courage, the character, and the intelligence of the American people. I know that they will continue to meet this challenge and that men and women, such as those who are here today, will keep our freedom for generations yet unborn.

Our Security as a Nation Demands That the Transportation Industry Be Strengthened if It Is To Portray Its Traditional Role as the Strong Right Arm of an Adequate National Defense

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is an accepted fact that in time of na-

tional emergency the transportation system of the Nation is faced with a herculean task in maintaining the equipment necessary in meeting the constantly pressing demands for greatly expanded services.

Failure by this Congress to come to grips with the transportation problem would constitute gross dereliction of duty and abdication of responsibility, to the detriment of our vital transportation industry and of the great American public, whose interests we are sworn to uphold. This I firmly believe, and emphasize, today.

According to the recent report titled "National Transportation Policy" released by a special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee, all of the domestic common carriers of passengers have found the number of empty seat-miles increasing since 1946. The rate of increase has been most pronounced in railroad service causing the passenger deficit to climb from less than \$200 million in 1946 to over \$700 million in 1957.

More current figures reflecting the decrease in passenger traffic volume reveal that the rate of return for the railroad industry for the 12-month period ending May 31, 1961, was only 1.45 percent—the lowest since the depression period of the 1930's.

With regard to the Nation's airlines the Senate study group found that—

While the available seat-miles for domestic trunk and local airlines from 1946 to 1959 increased from 7,490 million to 45,793 million, or almost six times, the revenue passenger-miles increased from 5,910 million to only 29,151 million or a little over five times. The result has been an increase of empty seat-miles from 1,580,000 to 16,642,000 or by an increase of 15,062,000 empty-seat miles.

Current figures reveal that during the first 6 months of 1961 the trunk airlines lost \$20 million and sustained a 2 percent drop in passenger traffic volume.

In addition to the findings by the special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee the national trade associations for all three of the major public carriers—air, bus, and rail—report they are operating below their capacity for handling passenger traffic. Both the buslines and railroads are operating well below 50 percent of capacity while the current load factor of the airlines of 59.5 percent is at the lowest level in 10 years.

In addition to the decrease experienced by the air, bus, and railroad industries, many common carrier trucklines are also facing difficulty.

Despite recommendations made following the series of studies by congressional committees and in reports filed the past several years following studies made by various States through State legislative committees no positive action has been taken to solve the ills of the transportation industry.

Meanwhile a negative attitude has been taken by the Kennedy administration in dealing with the problems of the national transportation system.

The President opposed repeal of the 10 percent World War II tax on passenger transportation. In addition he postponed until 1962 plans formulated by

appropriate Federal agencies to aid the transportation industry.

Commenting on the prospect of a year's delay of transportation remedies, Richard Wagner, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, said:

I doubt if we can afford to wait this long. This industry, in the last 5 years, has been studied to death, both by the administration and Congress. What is needed is action, not more study.

The Kennedy administration announced that plans to provide legislative remedies for the ills of our transportation system were to be revealed in a message to Congress.

President Kennedy, however, canceled the message, indicating he was uncertain as to what action should be taken. This is plainly evident by his assertion more study was needed.

Speaking of studies and surveys regarding the Nation's transportation system, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the fall of 1959, the Kilday subcommittee, on which I was privileged to serve as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, conducted an investigation into the adequacy of transportation to support the national defense effort in event of mobilization.

Concerning railroads, the subcommittee drew this highly significant conclusion:

No plans for transport dependence can fail to take into account the railroad industry. The other forms of transport, important as they are to the total need, are auxiliary and supplemental to the railroads.

In addition to this investigation, transportation and the Nation's transportation policy have been the subject of six other major studies and reports since World War II. Without exception, these studies have stressed the fundamental importance of railroads—healthy railroads—to the Nation's economy and defense. It is worth recalling here what they found.

From the progress report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, October 1951:

Railroads are the backbone of the American transportation system. This will continue to be the case so long as the railroads serve as the primary means for the movement of heavy materials and commodities in bulk.

In time of war the railroads perform an indispensable service . . .

From the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization, April 1955:

The railroads may be expected to have greatest flexibility in accommodating an expanded domestic traffic with a minimum increase in equipment. Any policy which strengthens the railroad base will tend to increase the built-in flexibility of our transportation plant.

From the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 1958:

The railroads were, and are, a vital part of this Nation's security.

From the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on "The Passenger Train Deficit," May 1959:

Economic railroad passenger service is, and for the foreseeable future will be, an integral part of our national transportation system and essential for the Nation's well-being and defense.

From a report of the U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1960:

The Government should support the common carrier system upon which the economy must rely, and which is so vital for national security.

From the report of the Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in the United States prepared for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, January 1961:

Railroads are our most pervasive form of mass transportation and, over the years, our most experienced . . .

Bringing the railroads to a satisfactory state of readiness could be, because of their experience . . . and because of the latent capacity of the rails, the most immediately remunerative.

But despite the acknowledged essentiality of railroads Mr. Speaker, and despite the same authorities having warned with equal unanimity that outmoded transportation policies and laws are forcing this vital industry to the brink of disaster, I call the attention of my colleagues to a remarkable fact: This Congress, although not lacking for concrete proposals and although confronted with grave international crises that could multiply the reliance we place on railroads almost overnight, has failed to act.

Ironically, we have managed to find hundreds of millions of tax dollars for the development of railroads in friendly and not so friendly countries abroad. For the future it appears that we may be called upon not only to continue our multi-billion-dollar program of aid to countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, but also to underwrite a Latin American program costing the astronomical sum of \$20 billion. But for railroads at home—for the one form of transportation that is basic to all others and to the Nation's economy and security—the one form that asks only equal treatment and equal opportunity to compete—for that form of transportation this Congress has done nothing.

May I also remind my colleagues Mr. Speaker, of the pledges to right the wrong now being done our railroads which both parties solemnly wrote into their platforms in 1960. In the Democratic platform, a plank pledging the "coordination and modernization" of all forms of transportation reads in part as follows:

The Nation's railroads are in particular need of freedom from burdensome regulation to enable them to compete effectively with other forms of transportation. We also support Federal assistance in meeting certain capital needs particularly for urban mass transportation.

The Republican platform pledged "continued improvement of our vital transportation network." It also made recommendations for "broadly based tax reform to foster job-making and growth-making investment for modernization and expansion including realistic incentive depreciation schedules."

In the face of these pledges, Mr. Speaker, and with the assurance of bilateral support for a positive program to aid this vital industry, I submit that both the railroads and the public are entitled to ask why nothing has been done.

The period of mobilization envisioned by our Armed Services Subcommittee in 1959 is no longer in the realm of speculation; it is upon us. The time for mobilizing or improving the readiness of the one form of transportation that everyone agrees is absolutely vital to the Nation's defense and the waging of war is rapidly running out, if indeed it has not already passed. The mobilization and preparation of our railroads to handle the greatly added burdens that would certainly be theirs must rate equally high priority with the other mobilization measures now underway. For unprepared railroads in time of war could be this Nation's Achilles' heel—the one vulnerable point in our otherwise indestructible armor that could prove our undoing.

Yet instead of getting better, the already critical situation of many of our railroads grows steadily worse. And instead of the forthright leadership necessary to restore them to health, we are offered only more procrastination and foot-dragging delay.

Despite the seven major studies of transportation made since World War II, the President's solution is to call for still another study and report—this one to be made by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary is directed to submit his findings and recommendations by November 1, which of course would be too late for any constructive action at this session and quite possibly too late—in terms of the Nation's security and the threat confronting us in Europe.

In his directive to the Secretary of Commerce, President Kennedy observed that—

The current difficulties facing all segments of the transportation industry will require increased leadership and additional actions on the part of the Federal Government.

I could not agree more. But the time for exercising this leadership is now—not at the next session of Congress, or later, when the opportunity may have been lost for all time.

I recognize, of course, that the probability of enacting at this session the comprehensive program for the transportation industry that is called for is remote. But there is still time for the enactment of measures widely regarded as necessary to keep the transportation industry and especially the railroads afloat until the more comprehensive program can be prepared. These emergency measures were recently described in identical letters addressed to you, as Speaker, and to the Presiding Officer of the Senate by Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads. They include, as I am sure you know, more realistic policies for the depreciation of railroad plant and equipment and repeal of the 10-percent Federal excise tax on the fares of for-hire

carriers. Bills to implement both of these proposals are now before appropriate committees of the Congress.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that both liberalization of depreciation allowances and repeal of the travel tax are called for in four of the major reports on transportation made since World War II. In the other reports they were not subjects for consideration; hence no recommendations were made either pro or con. May I also remind you that depreciation matters have received favorable consideration by both parties in their platforms as well as by party leaders, including President Kennedy.

Enactment of liberalized depreciation allowances, in particular, is the fastest and surest means I know of facilitating railroad modernization and improvement. Compared with other more comprehensive action which must be taken at least in the next session, the proposals for liberalization of depreciation allowances and repeal of the travel tax are extremely modest. I strongly urge favorable action on at least these minimum proposals before this session of Congress adjourns.

Congress Plays "Political Pattycake"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in its issue of August 23, the Albany, Ga., Herald featured an excellent editorial pointing out the incongruity of the Congress of the United States wasting its time on the politically contrived issue of civil rights while, in its words, "the world teeters upon the brink of war." It aptly describes the performance in this regard as playing "political pattycake." The telling point of this editorial is one which the junior Senator from Georgia is sure has not been lost upon Americans who feel that Congress should give more attention to the survival of our Nation than to the winning of the next election. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial, entitled "More Civil Rights Pap," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CIVIL RIGHTS PAP

The world teeters upon the brink of war. The armaments race builds madly toward an approaching climax. The specter of sudden death haunts fully half of the population of the earth. A return of the Stone Age is a grim possibility for the survivors.

Yet in these perilous times, what is the issue under debate in the Senate of the United States? Is it peace or war? Is it survival or extinction? Is it democracy versus communism? Is it freedom against slavery?

No, the sole issue with which our elected representatives in the world's greatest democracy have chosen to come to grips at

this tense juncture of affairs is, asinine, civil rights.

Ostensibly, the question is whether the life of the Civil Rights Commission shall be extended from its scheduled expiration of November 9. Actually, however, the question really is how many votes the Republican and Democratic Parties may expect to extract from the growing Negro minority in the 1962 congressional elections.

If the resulting spectacle appears slightly ridiculous in the eyes of anxious Americans, it is because it is, in truth, precisely just that. For the fact is that the several acts of the Congress in the last 5 years, coupled with the provisions of the U.S. Constitution, are sufficient to bulwark all of the rights, civil and otherwise, which any reasonable human being could expect from any society, whatever its political philosophy. The fact is, too, that if the civil rights of American citizens, whatever their color or creed, were being violated on any such widespread scale as the sponsors of this legislation infer, although they do not so specify, the Federal judiciary would be choked with cases brought under the aegis of a stern-eyed, ever watchful Government.

Yet, strangely, there are few such cases in our courts. And there are few such active complaints pending before the Civil Rights Commission.

Why all the hassle, then, in the Senate? Simply because the mathematics of politics is formidably exact. In many congressional districts, and in many States, as was the case in the last presidential election, the Negro vote provides the balance of power in any close contest. Ergo, politically speaking, this minority must be courted carefully and the most productive means yet found by politicians has been via the civil rights route.

Consequently, political considerations outweigh all others, even ponderous affairs of state, in these circumstances. And the Senate, which glories in the characterization as "the most august deliberative body on earth," becomes something less as it plays political pattycake while the Nation edges closer to war.

A Job for the Attorney General?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor, in his article which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun on August 25, has an excellent suggestion for Cyrus Eaton and others like him. Isn't it about time somebody blew the whistle on these so-called Americans?

WOULD CYRUS EATON LIVE IN RUSSIA?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Cleveland tycoon Cyrus S. Eaton, the very rich and powerful crony of the U.S.S.R., who plays a thoroughly damaging part in the life of our country, violates no statute, although Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut raised the question in the U.S. Senate whether he is not afool of the Logan Act, which prohibits unauthorized negotiations or intercourse with a foreign power, punishable by a fine or prison sentence (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1960, pp. 9888-9889).

He directed the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Eaton has done and is doing. Eaton was born in

Canada, where he still maintains a residence, moved to this country in 1900 and later became a naturalized citizen. It was through the Canadian door that Senator DODD reached the Logan Act question, as follows: "He has publicly urged Canada 'to completely dissociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs. If Eaton said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in public, then he has violated the Logan Act and should be prosecuted.'"

Supplying some background as well, Senator DODD continued: "Eaton claims 'American politicians in general are relentlessly driving us to war, that American officials do not represent the American people whereas in the Soviet Union the government speaks for all the people.' He says Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world, that 'Dr. Zhivago' was suppressed [there] because Soviet youth cannot bear any criticisms of their beloved government; that the Russian massacre of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon, etc.'"

Prior to this, at his own request, Eaton appeared (June 1958) before a House subcommittee which investigates pro-Soviet appeals in our barrel, Hollywood pro-Reds and some pitiable people as well whose disloyalty, long since abandoned, was an error in youth. The chairman, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania afterwards issued the following statement, in part: "It is believed that no useful purpose can be served by permitting Mr. Eaton to repeat the groundless accusations that Iron Curtain countries have used for propaganda purposes."

It can well be that communism at any time will put the feet of the world in marching boots. If this powerful man does not know that Soviet imperialism is based on a pattern of bloodshed, barbarism, suppression, and slavery he knows nothing; in his relations with Khrushchev and the Kremlin hierarchy in Russia, here and throughout the Communist world, he blames his own adopted country, the United States, dramatically, persistently and with great force in a whole pattern of charges.

We have room here for only one flag, and this excludes the Red flag which symbolizes all history's wars of conquest and intrigue, of avarice, cruelty, and ambition, while assuming the colors and usurping the banner of freedom.

Any American who says he is an American but also waves that flag lacks the elementary gratitude which anyone lacks who lives in freedom and espouses the cause of freedom's assassins instead of moving back out of the America to which he came and taking his chances in the opposing nation he praises. But will you see Cyrus Eaton moving next to Moscow and placing in communism's tender care the fortune he made here? I do not think so.

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 I placed in the RECORD the third of a series of four editorials appearing in the New York Daily News under the title, "The Nature of the Enemy." I have obtained the first and second in that series

and am glad to insert them, along with the fourth and last of the series in the RECORD today.

These editorials present a thoughtful and constructive treatment of our major national problem. I commend them to the careful attention of all who read the RECORD.

I call attention especially to the last few lines of the fourth editorial which read as follows:

Lastly, in our opinion, we need a new state of mind in the Kennedy administration, and in all administrations that may follow it for the duration of the cold war.

We need an aggressive and offensive state of mind—a will to conquer communism—to replace the notion that the best we can hope for is to hold our own and lose no more important positions to the enemy.

The bulk of the American people, we're convinced, are already in this wreck-the-Reds mood, and have been for a long time.

Our leaders need to catch up, we believe, with the majority of Americans. If they will do that, they can count on popular backing, to the hilt.

The editorials follow:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—I

We've used that title before, for editorials on what makes Communists tick and why they are so dangerous to all human liberty, decency, and progress though party members are rather few in number throughout the world.

In fact, a series of News editorials under this title was reprinted in booklet form a year or so ago. The booklet is obtainable at 25 cents a copy (lower rates for quantity orders) from America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, N.Y.

This new series under the same title is planned to run each Monday in the News for the next 3 or 4 weeks.

The series will summarize a program of the Russian Communist Party, drawn up by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade hoods, murderers, and usurpers, and released to a waiting world several days ago.

Khrushchev and company plan to submit the 50,000-word paper to a world Communist get-together in Moscow next October. You can have one guess as to whether the comrades from all over will ratify it—though the Chinese Reds may object to parts of it.

It is one of the most tedious, terribly written screeds ever, we are convinced, put on paper anywhere.

The fact that at least two News men have read the thing from beginning to end is a testimonial to the way the News constantly sweats and strains to serve you readers, you lucky rascals.

For all that, this latest Communist manifesto is no laughing matter, and its broad outlines ought to be known throughout the free world. Here goes. The introduction sums up in slanted fashion the history of the world Communist movement from 1848 to the present time.

It was in 1848 that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels issued the first Communist Manifesto, leading off with the words: "A specter is haunting Europe, the specter of communism," and going on to put a solemn curse on every aspect of the primitive European capitalism of that day.

FROM MANIFESTO TO PARIS COMMUNE

Few people paid any attention to Marx and Engels when these two doctrinaire dreamers issued their manifesto, and it was years before the Communist movement amounted to anything.

It erupted briefly and disastrously in the Paris Commune (March-May, 1871), just after France lost the Franco-Prussian War. There was fighting on street barricades; the Communists murdered the archbishop of

Paris; and at last the insurrection was put down by veteran French troops under Marshal Maurice de McMahon.

The next big development in communism's history was the 1905 uprising in Russia, for which the present-day Reds calmly give all credit to their party.

Actually, though Communists were active in this upheaval, it was mainly a liberal and Socialist affair, and it scared the government of Czar Nicholas II (1868-1918) into bringing about a lot of long-overdue reforms.

MARCH OF COMMUNISM

The Communists really went to town in the Russian Revolution of 1917, when Russia had been hammered to its knees by the World War I armies of German Kaiser Wilhelm II.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and his comrade Communist thugs toppled the moderate reform government of Alexander Kerensky in Moscow, and, as the saying went, telegraphed the revolution to the provinces.

Communists have terrorized Russia ever since. They capitalized on World War II and the folly-or-worse of President Franklin D. Roosevelt by extending their slave-nation empire throughout central Europe. Tito's Yugoslavia presently "broke" with Moscow, but remained Communist.

In 1949, the Chinese Reds, with an important assist from various dubious characters in the U.S. State Department, drove Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek off the Asiatic mainland and onto Formosa.

Communism now tyrannizes over some 1 billion people. The program we're discussing outlines plans for extending Communist slavery to the rest of the human race, most definitely including the American people.

Of that, more next Monday.

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—II

This is the second of a series of Monday editorials on the 50,000-word program for the world Communist movement, recently tacked together in Moscow by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade bandits, thieves, and murderers.

After a windy and biased introduction (summarized here last Monday), the document proceeds to a long song and dance labeled "Part One: The Transition From Capitalism to Communism Is the Road of Human Progress."

The juiciest item in this section of the Red program, we'd say, is a series of lies about present-day capitalism as it operates in the United States.

It seems, according to "Khrushchev & Co.," that the gap between the haves and have-nots is widening rapidly in our benighted country, and that more and more workers are suffering more pathetically every day.

This is because capitalism is allegedly loaded with "contradictions" (not specified so that an ordinary or even an extraordinary American can tell what they are) which are bound to do our system in sooner or later.

That will be news to a lot of us.

Particularly will it surprise the tens of millions of working people whose standards of living have been improving for decades, and the people in the high income brackets whose earnings are pretty largely grabbed by the Internal Revenue Service.

That makes no never mind to the modern Red doctrinaires, though. They are as convinced as were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the 19th-century pappies of communism, that the rich get richer and the poor poorer under capitalism, and that communism is the next stage in human progress, all over the world.

It will come peaceably to some countries, says the new Communist manifesto, and violently to others. And the Reds everywhere in the free world are instructed to

help these upheavals along in every way they can.

WORLDWIDE AGITATION

That explains the Red-inspired U.S. student riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities . . . the ban-the-big-bomb agitations in England . . . much of the unrest in the Congo . . . Fidel Castro's plotting to turn Latin America Communist . . . and virtually all the other ferments and civil turmoils that plague the planet today.

It also explains the Red-front organizations which, wearing innocent-looking masks, get in a great deal of dirty work for the Kremlin in this country and many others.

To hear Khrushchev and his cronies tell it, this current misery is taking the human race to—a brave new world—in which all our troubles will have been wiped away.

In what is quite possibly the biggest of all the big lies in this tedious and frightfully written paper, the authors solemnly state:

"Socialism has solved a great social problem—it has abolished the exploiting classes and the causes engendering the exploitation of man by man. There are now two friendly classes in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the working class and the peasantry."

JUST A BAND OF BROTHERS, IS IT?

Actually, the exploitation of the Russian people by their Communist slavemasters makes the 19th century capitalist exploitation of United States and British workers look like a love feast.

The difference between the highest salaries and the lowest wages paid in Soviet Russia is far wider than in the United States.

As for the peasants, they hate the Kremlin's guts because it takes away all of their surplus crops for distribution among the nonfarm population, with the 6 million or so members of the Communist Party (out of a population of some 200 million) getting the pick of all the produce.

There can be no friendliness between workers and peasants under such conditions. Instead, Russia is plagued interminably with food shortages because the peasants slack on the job and hide what farm products they can from the government food snatchers.

That is a far worse "contradiction" than any that exists in the United States, and one which the Reds in 40-plus years' trying have not been able to solve.

We expect to continue this discussion next Monday.

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—IV

In this last editorial of a series on the 50,000-word 20-year Communist Party program recently issued by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade cutthroats, we'll try to outline a few of the things we believe the free nations—particularly the United States—can do to counter and eventually wreck the Communist conspiracy.

This conspiracy is a plot to make slaves of the two-thirds of the human race that are not already enslaved to the Reds.

To keep the cold war from getting hot, we need first, last and always to maintain military forces strong and well equipped enough to clobber any enemy or coalition that may make a businesslike pass at us.

Our best information is that in this department the United States is in reasonably good shape and growing more so.

Holding such an insurance policy against a hot war, we can go—

ON THE OFFENSIVE

In the cold war; and if you ask us, the sooner we take the offensive the better.

We could, for example, start a progressive economic squeeze on Soviet Russia and Communist East Germany, to encourage them to pull back in Berlin, and pull back fast.

The Red slave drivers need Western goods—special steels, electronic gadgets, certain chemicals—far more than the free world needs anything the Red slave empire has to sell.

ECONOMIC SQUEEZE; CUBA; WEAPON TESTS

Castro Cuba is another area where we can and should take the cold-war offensive without further delay or worrying about what our Latin American friends may think. Latin Americans, like other people, respect those who stand up for their rights.

We could begin by cutting off all remaining United States-Cuba trade, follow that up with a naval and air blockade of Cuba, and proceed from there to still more vigorous steps if any were needed—which is unlikely.

We should also, it seems to us, resume nuclear weapon tests as soon as we can. That would (1) rapidly improve our nuclear arsenal, and (2) show the world that the United States at last had stopped believing that you can trust any Communist promises on any subject.

As for the propaganda war which is the important part of the whole cold war effort, we could be doing a lot better than we are.

Eugene Lyons years ago wrote a whole book on the proposition that some of our best potential allies are the peoples of the captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania; and, for that matter, the Ukraine, in Russia itself.

WRECKING 'EM FROM WITHIN

Most of our propaganda effort could well be aimed at encouraging these people to do all sorts of termite jobs on the Red slave-state structure—pull factory slow-downs, turn out defective goods for export, sabotage railroads, keep down production on collective farms, and so on.

Maybe we can't wreck the Communist set-up from within; but maybe we can, and the attempt to do so is well worth a lot more energy than is going into it now.

If we must continue to let Soviet cultural and study groups come over here, how about showing them around our whole great Nation (except for defense-installation areas), so that they can tell the home folks how vigorous and wealthy the allegedly decadent United States really is?

Lastly, in our opinion, we need a new state of mind in the Kennedy administration, and in all administrations that may follow it for the duration of the cold war.

We need an aggressive and offensive state of mind—a will to conquer communism—to replace the notion that the best we can hope for is to hold our own and lose no more important positions to the enemy.

CATCH UP WITH THE BULK OF US

The bulk of the American people, we're convinced, are already in this wreck-the-Reds mood, and have been for a long time.

Our leaders need to catch up, we believe, with the majority of Americans. If they will do that, they can count on popular backing, to the hilt.

A Recovery and a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Recovery and a Difference,"

delivered by Mr. Matt S. Szymczak at the management policy conference of the Kentucky Bankers Association, in Louisville, Ky., on July 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RECOVERY AND A DIFFERENCE

Yesterday—it seems like yesterday—I was here very often going back and forth to and from school—high school and college. The school is south of here near where Francis Scott Key wrote our national anthem. In fact, my good friend, Senator COOPER, on his own cordial initiative made mention of that fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with my retirement from that Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for which I have and always will have the deepest feeling of gratitude and very high regard. I thank Senator COOPER and, of course, I thank you for inviting me here so soon after my resignation from a Government agency.

I feel very good here. This is the State in which I studied, played football, basketball, baseball, and tennis, swam, went fishing and bowled. I don't remember anybody here who had any trouble with my name. In fact, I don't think that anybody here even knew I had a name. I just worked here, I just played here, and, as I recall, it was just yesterday, I played more than I worked and believe me I liked that.

You will, therefore, understand and forgive me for getting a little emotional on this occasion as my memory takes me back to what is so vivid, and so recent, and so pleasant, and as my feeling of cordiality extends into today and tomorrow—very close to yesterday—and express respect for the institution and the human beings with whom I am now associated—C. J. Devine & Co. With them I feel very much at home. I like them, and I respect them, and I am proud of our association.

The title of a talk or an article is usually intended to catch the eye and, if it relates to our personal interests, we pursue it further, if not, we move on to something else, and so with spoken and written messages, they must catch the eye first and to compel further pursuit by the listener or reader must awaken personal interest. I write and speak this message to bankers, not only here but everywhere in our country—to you whose business relates to the depositor and to the borrower. Deposits are money and borrowing is credit. If our economy rises to a high level which can be maintained, you, the banker, are in a better position to maintain your business at a high level and as you do that you help others, you help the economy, you help economic recovery. Like almost anything, our economy has many sides and many segments. It isn't all money and credit. In fact, to a large degree, money and credit are but a reflection of buying and selling—buying by the consumer and selling by the producer or by the merchant. As buying and selling progresses, production by industry increases. As production increases, employment increases.

All this brings us to our message—our message of economic recovery. We were in a recession not so long ago; we are now in the process of economic recovery. The outlook is good, but just as not all recessions are the same or due to the same proximate causes, so too not all recoveries are the same and so too economic policy of our Government has to be adjusted to meet the existing situation as it is and not as it would be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write on. It must be timely, it must be relevant, and both monetary and fiscal policy must integrate to the same end.

Today, therefore, I write and talk on that subject just as often before I wrote and spoke on monetary policy and tried to explain in everyday language what it is and

what it can and cannot do in our free, dynamic, competitive economy through the instruments of open market operations, reserve requirements, and discounts and discount rates, as well as the selective instrument of margin requirements. Often before I pointed out that essential to a stable, high level economy is fiscal policy—Government expenditures, Government revenues, and I pointed out how important it is to have both monetary and fiscal policies work in unison to the same end and at the right time. What I write and say here is exactly the kind of information the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have—and much more—in order to meet their responsibilities in the public interest, to you and to me. The best any human being can attain in a single message is to awaken interest to the end of pursuing the subject further: to meet our responsibilities as businessmen, as citizens, and to awaken our interest in the responsibilities of our Government to preserve what we have gained in all these many years, by dedication to our system through its free economy and its democracy.

We are out of the recession. We are making a nice recovery. We can safely look ahead to many months of continuing expansion. If experts disagree it is only about pace and depth of the continuing recovery—are we going to have, before long, a full-blown boom, or is it going to a slow rise—coasting along on a plateau, with plenty of excess capacity remaining, with unemployment continuing high, and with little pressure on prices?

There are indications that this recovery will be rather different from earlier ones, and will raise some problems which we have not faced before. I would like to discuss with you the nature of this recovery and its difference and some of its implications.

You know the record of recent weeks. But let me cite it again for this writing. Industrial output has been rising steadily since March, from 102.6 percent of the 1957 average in March to 110 percent in June. This is as good as July 1960 and only 1 percentage point below the peak of January 1960. Average weekly earnings of factory workers reached an alltime high of \$94.24 in June. Business inventories have stopped declining, and in May actually gained \$100 million. The Commerce Department estimates that total construction expenditures in 1961 will reach \$57.8 billion, a rise of 4 percent over 1960. The latest survey of consumer attitudes by the Michigan Survey Research Center shows that more people plan to buy new cars during the next 12 months than planned to do so a year ago, with an especially heavy gain suggested for the fourth quarter of this year. Installment debt in the first 5 months of 1961 declined by \$375 million; seen in conjunction with steadily rising personal incomes, this means that the public is becoming more liquid and is in a good position to step up its purchases in the months to come. Add to this the fact that the rate of Government expenditures is rising, too, especially for defense, and you have solid reasons for believing that the rate of output will continue to climb throughout 1961 and at least the better part of 1962.

There is furthermore no danger that a lack of funds will slow the recovery. Demand for business loans has not been heavy; in fact, commercial and industrial loans in the central reserve cities have recently been falling off. Partly as a consequence, Federal Reserve member banks' free reserves are considerably above \$500 million.

Interest rates continue moderate. Money market rates have been moving within a fairly narrow range since the beginning of the year; and the yield pattern on U.S. Government securities is fairly similar to what it was before the Federal Reserve began its nudging operations, with the average inter-

est rate just a little higher than last January. No money tightness is anywhere in sight.

But there are also good reasons to doubt that this continuing recovery will soon reach boom proportions. Fiscal 1962 is expected to show a deficit of approximately \$5 billion—a healthy boost to the economy, but hardly enough, in the present relaxed state of the economy, to engender really inflationary pressures. And while expenditures in fiscal 1963 are likely to go up further, revenues at present rates may come to roughly \$90 billion. That might make possible a tax cut next year and still yield a surplus. Moreover, while the expected buildup in business inventories will provide a stimulus, there is as yet little indication that capital outlays on expansion and improvement—the great booster during the 1955-57 boom—will change very much. Present plans suggest total capital spending in 1961 of \$34.5 billion, 3 percent less than in 1960. The reason seems to be that most industries still have more than enough capacity to meet demand.

That brings me to the features which seem likely to set this recovery apart from the recovery after the first three postwar recoveries. We are clearly headed for new postwar highs in most fields, and there is no evident danger of a downturn for many months to come. But whether the trend will soon carry us to full capacity volume seems very doubtful indeed. Plant capacity, as I have pointed out, is ample in most industries. The labor force is now rapidly increasing, with the war and postwar baby boom hitting the labor market. What is more, the progress of automation makes it possible to expand output with relatively little increase in employment. As a consequence unemployment, which has for months been hovering at just below 7 percent of the labor force, may for a long time remain considerably above the 4 percent level that is considered acceptable by the administration. The implications of this could be far reaching.

Labor unions may in the future be less interested in hourly wage boosts, and put more emphasis on fixed yearly incomes, a shorter workweek, and earlier retirement, in other words, on measures to spread the work. Excess capacity may prevent any early upward pressure on prices. These factors, together with the determination of the administration not to see the recovery prematurely strangled, as was the case in 1960, would lead one to expect that there will be less preoccupation with the dangers of inflation; continued easy or at least neutral money policies; and possibly tax cuts to push the economy closer to its full potential.

What is that going to mean in terms of interest rates and stock and bond prices? In the first half of this year the administration and the Federal Reserve have succeeded reasonably well in preventing the short-term rate from falling any further while keeping the long-term rate from rising as the recovery got underway. Thus, according to Under Secretary Roosa, the policy of trying to encourage a flow of long-term funds into business channels "has succeeded beyond our wildest dreams—the volume of corporate and municipal securities in the second quarter was a record." It must be expected that long-term rates will rise somewhat as the recovery progresses, but probably not excessively. Not only are the authorities poised to prevent a steep rise, but there is also the prospect of more funds flowing into the bond market. For a long time now there has been a remarkable yield spread between stocks and bonds. In the past the willingness of investors to be satisfied with a relatively low yield on equities has been explained on two grounds: expected growth, and hedging against inflation. But the profit squeeze casts doubt on a growth argument and excess capacity and recent instances of price

cutting make the danger of renewed inflation seem less imminent. Under such circumstances fixed interest securities may well appear more and more attractive to many investors, especially in view of the higher yields.

There is one last feature of our present recovery that needs to be mentioned: our heightened sensitivity to the balance of international payments. Throughout the postwar years we could implement desired domestic policies with little or no regard to international repercussions—indeed, during the years of the so-called dollar gap, the greatest contribution we could make to international stability was to keep our economy working as close to capacity as possible. But all that has now changed. Not only are we acutely conscious, after 3 years of heavy international deficits, that every pickup in our domestic economy is bound to spill over into increased imports, last year's speculation against the dollar has also brought home to us how vulnerable we have become through the use of the dollar as an international reserve currency. With a \$17 billion gold stock in our hands, and \$20 billion short-term dollars balances in the hands of foreigners, that elusive thing "confidence" has suddenly become important. No longer is it good enough for our balance-of-payments position to be sound; it must be seen and judged to be sound. Fortunately for us, our balance of payments has of late been improving. Our deficit has been running at a rate of approximately \$1.2 billion annually so far, and is expected to remain at the figure for the full year, compared to \$3.8 billion in 1960. The outflow of short-term capital has apparently stopped, and the value of our exports continues to exceed the value of imports by an annual rate of approximately \$5 billion more or less. So far our expanding domestic activity has not yet brought the feared rise in imports, and the continuing boom abroad, especially in West Germany and Japan, gives promise of keeping our exports relatively high. The fact remains, nonetheless, that nowadays we have to keep looking over our shoulder to watch our foreign transactions. Renewed inflation would promptly hurt our exports, and the repercussions would be serious. The fancy-free days of the early postwar years are indeed gone, and we suddenly find, as so many other countries have before us, that prosperity raises almost as many problems as it solves.

That we are in the midst of a healthy recovery is evident, and is something to be grateful for. But it is also clear that in the problems it raises, this recovery is unlike any that preceded it.

None of this is new or revealing or even stimulative. All of this is prosaic, matter of fact, but good for you and me to read and hear over and over again to afford us an informed and receptive attitude for more information and constant search for solutions of the problems that emerge. Let's cease looking for headlines. Let's read and study the facts and the figures.

More pointedly, therefore, let me emphasize the need for us as bankers to know the domestic and international situation; the economic and the political activities—the private and the public needs and satisfactions. No longer can you and I say that we are concerned only with our own bank—our own business—for that means we have no other interest—public or private; those days are gone forever. We must be government conscious—we must be conscious of our national and international economic and political problems and seek their solution. And we must do all of this—as we do our daily work, objectively and thoroughly and consistently. In this way, we make a contribution to the welfare and to the safety and to the efficacy and to the preservation of

free enterprise and free markets and freedom of our people. This, believe me, is not just an oratorical outburst at the end of this paper. It comes from my heart and from my years of experience in Government. I know you know that.

Let's get together again—whenever we can.

Flags of Convenience in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the current maritime strike has as one of its principle issues the question of flags of convenience. I am advised that ships totaling approximately 10 million deadweight tons have been constructed by private American capital and are now under foreign registry in Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. Such ships are referred to as flags of convenience.

From a standpoint of national defense, these ships can be recovered for our national needs in the event of a national emergency. However, we are facing a situation under which the owners of these tankers and bulk cargo carriers may sell or make an outright transfer of these ships to foreign countries. In that event, the right of recovery of these ships in a national emergency would cease to exist.

Since we do not have, under American registry, sufficient tonnage of this type of ship to meet the requirements of national defense in times of national emergency, it is both important and urgent that we adopt a national policy which will protect the national interest.

This situation has led to an exchange of correspondence between the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Hon. Roswell Gilpatric, and me. In view of the importance of this matter to the national interest, I feel it both proper and necessary to bring this correspondence to the public attention. The Deputy Secretary has agreed to the necessity and propriety of this course of action.

The exchange of correspondence was as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.
Washington, August 24, 1961.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to put before you the interest of the Department of Defense in the flags-of-convenience question, one of the issues in the dispute that led to the maritime strike of last spring.

The Taft-Hartley injunction against the continuance of the maritime strike will expire September 20, and if the dispute is not resolved by that time, the strike is likely to be resumed by the west coast unions. If this should happen and the strike should continue, we are advised that some owners of flags-of-convenience vessels may sell the ships to foreign uncontrolled registries.

Because of the effect which such a transfer of tonnage out of U.S. control would have on defense needs in the event of a national emergency, we asked the Secretary of the Navy to review its requirements for flags-of-convenience vessels in the event of war. The Navy has done so and has confirmed its previous position that it is imperative

that "U.S. effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping be retained." That position has been adopted as the Defense Department's position in the matter, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor have been so informed. A complete statement of that position is as follows:

"1. The primary interest of the Department of Defense in flags-of-convenience shipping relates to the impact of our national defense posture and this interest is to insure the availability under U.S. control of as much of this shipping as may be needed in the event of national emergency. The amount of active U.S.-flag shipping now available is inadequate for almost any situation of war or emergency and must be augmented by shipping which can be brought under our direct control as required in the event of an emergency.

"2. It is considered imperative that United States effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping be retained. Further, it is considered that such flags-of-convenience shipping as is covered by agreements or contracts with owners can be brought under our operational control as was done in World War II.

"3. This dependence on effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping for emergency use is an expedient. It would be much more desirable to have adequate U.S.-flag tonnage available. However, this ideal situation does not exist, and until enough U.S.-flag tonnage is available, we will need to rely on flags-of-convenience ships.

"4. Until such time as our national emergency needs can be completely met by modern American-flag shipping, the Department of Defense has no recourse but to support the flags-of-convenience concept. The possible loss of the shipping capability represented by American-owned shipping of Panlibhon registry to uncontrolled registries is of great concern to the Department of Defense."

In view of Defense interest in having available sufficient merchant tonnage for military shipping tonnage in emergency situations we would like to see established a national policy based on the above position, and the Secretary of Labor has informed me that he agrees with this view. Therefore, without taking sides in the current labor-management controversy in the maritime industry, the Defense Department intends to do all it can to have its position adopted as national policy.

Believing that you will share our concern in a matter of this importance to U.S. national security, I would appreciate an expression of your own views in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROSSELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1961.

HON. ROSWELL GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of August 24 wherein you outline the interest of the Department of Defense in the flags-of-convenience question, and the possible adverse impact which this question could have upon our national defense capabilities in the event of an emergency.

Inasmuch as the Taft-Hartley injunction will expire on September 20, and none of us can predict developments beyond that date, it is quite obvious that this matter is of the highest importance in defense considerations. By this same token, I deem the prompt adoption of a firm national policy on this matter to be of equal importance.

As you point out, such action is required in the national interest. I want you to know that I fully agree with the national policy position which you propose and urge you

to pursue its adoption at the highest levels of government as promptly as possible.

This matter transcends the interests of any individual or group and it is my judgment that our exchange of correspondence on the subject should be made a matter of public record. Accordingly, I propose to insert this correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would appreciate your expression as to that proposed course of action.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

Berlin Bungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, when President Kennedy appointed General Taylor as his personal military adviser—and many Members of Congress still think this is a violation of the law—it was expected that we would have no military problems in the future. Now, as it has turned out and according to the article by Ted Lewis in the New York Daily News on August 25, and the article by David Wise in the New York Herald Tribune on August 26, that we had no contingency plans ready in the Berlin crisis when the Reds sealed off with barbed wire the road to East Berlin, the American people have a right to ask why.

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—The most alarming bit of information about our handling of the Berlin crisis is that the Kennedy administration had no contingency plans ready when the Reds sealed off East Berlin with barbed wire.

Now if the Cuban invasion fiasco of last April proved anything, it was that in every crisis there should be hard plans ready for any contingency. In the Cuban experience there was nothing that reflected more on the President and his advisers than the fact that no one had even considered the possibility that the invasion would fail. So the administration had no plan of action ready.

More than 3 weeks ago, 10 days in advance of the setting up of the East Berlin barricades, one of our lower-rung experts on Germany made a good guess as to what was likely to happen. Unfortunately, he was not one of President Kennedy's many advisers.

This expert casually gave his opinion that the crisis would likely develop by sealing off the border, and this could lead to fighting.

"Do you know," he added, "they (the powers that be) have done no advance contingency planning for this?"

We have verified this. On Sunday, August 13, when the barbed wire went up, neither we nor any of our allies were prepared to take action. There had simply been no consideration of this possibility and what we ought to do should it happen.

For the sake of the record, however, once the barricades were clamped down, there came a call by diplomatic veterans for immediate drastic action—to which President Kennedy failed to respond.

In this cadre of Presidential advisers were former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Gen. Lucius Clay, former U.S. Military Governor for Germany, CIA officials (presumably

headed by Chief Allen Dulles) and Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. There were others in this group, middle echelon veterans of other cold war crises, so it constituted a pretty formidable array.

This group argues that there should have been a contingency plan. Yet since some of them, including Acheson, have had the President's ear on the Berlin crisis right along, we suspect their pitch for an advance plan was pretty weak tea or they would have got somewhere.

ACT FAST, THEY URGED KENNEDY

They did, however, press the President to act fast, once the border was closed. They urged that Allied troops should move up on the East Berlin border with instructions to pull down barbed wire and masonry walls without a by your leave.

"What if the East German troops start firing?" it was asked.

"That could happen," was the reply, "but we firmly believe they would back off rather than fight. And if they backed off, as we expect, undoubtedly it would be on orders coming from Khrushchev himself. Khrushchev certainly has a contingency plan. Our belief is that it was along this line—if the Allies strike at the barbed wire, don't fight."

This proposal for our troops to tear down the obstructions has obviously become less feasible with every passing day. Yet the hard-line school is still arguing that it should be done, better late than never. If, they say, the protocol boys are unhappy about such rude surprise, action, go ahead and send Mr. K. a little note, telling him that beginning at 8 a.m., Saturday, August 26, for example, we will clear the way into East Berlin.

RUSK'S COURSE SOMEWHAT OF A MYSTERY

President Kennedy, who has been ultra-cautious since his experience with Cuba, still won't buy this proposal. Instead, he is determined to follow the line pressed mainly by some State Department advisers. These include Assistant Secretary of State Foy D. Kohler and Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen, special assistant to Secretary Rusk and a top Russian expert.

What part Rusk played in influencing the President is somewhat of a mystery. As good a guess as any is that he did the side-lines act, which permitted him to be on the President's side whichever way the President moved.

The case of the Bohlen-Kohler contingent should be stated; otherwise it might appear the President was just running away from a showdown. These advisers argued that West Germany (meaning Chancellor Adenauer) did not favor drastic action at the time and still doesn't. (The reasons are involved, and it is not fair to oversimplify them briefly.)

PLAYING THE CRISIS BY EAR

They also argued that the alleged rights of the Allied powers in Berlin were based on complex agreements. It would, therefore, be unwise to take armed action which might kick off World War III unless we had a clear-cut legal case, which we probably don't in view of the way agreements have been allowed to erode since 1949.

The crux of their argument, however, is that the real guts issue is the survival of West Berlin itself and its people. So we should not fritter away our position by fighting over dubiously grounded rights.

"Keep your eyes on the heart of the matter" was their clincher argument at the White House.

So much for reporting the pros and cons of the inner-administration controversy. The important thing is that the administration is playing important phases of the Berlin crisis by ear. With all the highly touted braintrusts at Kennedy's beck and call, is it asking too much that just one double-

dome be assigned to the job of readying a plan to counter any move the Communists may make?

**CRISIS ADVISERS FAILED TO ALERT KENNEDY,
FORCED HAND, UPSET PLAN**

(By David Wise)

HYANNIS PORT, MASS., August 25.—The East German shutdown of the Berlin border has thrown a gigantic and unexpected monkey wrench into the administration's carefully-gear plan for handling the Berlin crisis.

This is becoming increasingly apparent to administration policymakers now that the effect of the border closing 2 weeks ago has had a chance to sink in. And President Kennedy, who flew here this afternoon for the weekend, is understood to be somewhat disappointed in his own advisers.

The President's discontent, according to informed officials, is based on his feeling that his advisers failed to anticipate the border shutdown and the explosive emotions it would generate in West Germany and West Berlin.

While some advisers made mention of the possibility that the East Germans would close the border between East and West Berlin, most of the working papers that reached the President's desk from the State Department and other branches of the Government failed to emphasize this as a likelihood or analyze the consequences.

As a result the White House found itself in the midst of a crisis that it had not foreseen, and was forced to take emergency action to deal with it.

Before the border shutdown, the administration had devised a timetable of moves designed to convince Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev that the United States meant business when it said it would not be forced out of West Berlin. These moves included a carefully staged military buildup, to be followed by negotiations, first among the Western powers, and then with Moscow, to resolve the crisis.

The border shutdown, officials now feel, has created such a potentially dangerous situation that the timetable may have to be moved up. Before the shutdown, the planning was to do no negotiating before the West German elections September 17. Now, there is talk of a Western Foreign Ministers meeting in New York shortly after Labor Day.

President Kennedy was here on Cape Cod 2 weekends ago when the Communist East German Government shut the Berlin border. The seriousness of the situation and the fact that West Berlin was a tinderbox of emotion became clear only in the days that followed. By the end of last week the President was obliged to act.

He decided to send Vice President JOHNSON and a 1,500-man Army battle group to Berlin last weekend to boost morale.

But the tension in the White House during all of last Friday, when the decision to send the battle group was made final, did not seep out to the public. President Kennedy, it was understood, was seriously concerned over the possibility that Soviet or East German troops would attempt to interfere with the battle group's movement across East Germany to West Berlin. Had this happened, it would very likely have led to an armed clash.

That is why the President left orders to be awakened in case of trouble when he went to bed last Friday at midnight. And that is why his military aide, Brig. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, spent the night in the White House "situation room" scanning reports of the battle group's progress up the autobahn.

The Chief Executive arrived at Otis Air Force Base near here at 4:30 p.m. by jet from Andrews Air Force Base outside of Washington and immediately helicoptered

to his seaside home. This is his ninth weekend in Hyannis Port since July 1.

Accompanying the President were his brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy; his sister, Pat, and her husband, Actor Peter Lawford; his brothers-in-law, Stephen E. Smith and R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., and several administration officials and family friends who hitchhiked a ride to summer homes in the area here. Mr. Kennedy will return to the Capital Monday morning.

The Evils of Size

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following penetrating article which appeared in the Minnetonka Herald in my district in Minnesota, on June 1:

THE EVILS OF SIZE

(Guest editorial by Frank P. Leslie)

Anyone who has served in the Federal Government knows the feeling of helplessness that comes over every individual as he is swallowed up by its very size.

To work in any organization where it makes little difference what you do, to find out that everyone around you has come to the same conclusion, inevitably results in a deadening of spirit and in a lessening of conscience.

The indifference of performance that results from such experience is bad enough but it is not the whole story.

When an ambitious man discovers that he can satisfy none of his ambitions for the organization as a whole, he begins to satisfy his own ambitions. He no longer cares what happens to the cause or the work itself but has his eye on what is going to happen to him. Empire building is the inevitable consequence and politics in its worst form the most inviting ambition.

The government then functions not for the sake of the people but for the sake of individuals and their own ambitions.

The government being monopolistic, the disciplines of competition do not restrain the personal ambitions of men, so the people's dollars are spent regardless of the service rendered or the efficiency of the performance itself. All government spending is limited only by the taxing power, not the productive or creative power which motivates individual enterprise.

In the end it makes no difference whether the all-powerful government exists in our country, in Spain, in Russia, or anywhere else. The ambitions of men are the same everywhere. The evils of monopoly are the same everywhere.

Our country was born out of the conception that the individual is important. The greatest teacher of this truth was Jesus Christ. The infusion of Christian principle into our form of government was the real cause for the genius of American creativity.

It is not enough to say that there were great natural resources in our country. The development of these resources came from the awakened spirit of individuals who found in our country, the freedom to do their best and to receive a reward for their labors. The terrific impact of human desire to achieve and the belief that each man could achieve is the real secret of the greatness of America.

When everyone thinks he has a chance to achieve, the competition becomes tre-

mendous and inevitably somebody gets hurt. Someone does better than another. We forget that the whole society have done better under this concept than under any other previously invented by the human mind and spirit. We were on the right track when we set up regulatory bodies for such monopolies as public utilities and when we passed the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Now an unfortunate reaction has set in. In our desire to cushion the blows of vigorous competition and individual enterprise, we have overaccented the necessity of security. In our desire for security, we are seeking more and more the benevolence of our Government and therefore increasing its power over us, while losing our faith in ourselves.

Our entire economic system is changing from free vigorous competition to governmental regimentation, and the disappearance of the individual in the labyrinth of governmental domination.

The outworn system of cartels has made its appearance in our American enterprise. Price fixing is just a form of cartel. A closed shop union is another form of cartel. Both represent an artificial attempt to achieve security as a substitute for the earned security we have traditionally sought.

When a poor workman cannot be replaced by a better workman, we are no longer a worthy competitor in anything. Let this concept enter the field of sports and the stands will be empty. Let it prevail in music (the battle is on right now) and the Metropolitan Opera will be no more.

This concept now spreading through all phases of American life is deadly poison. It will kill our country. It is already deadening the spirit of our people.

In the great and generous spirit of the American people, there is a proper desire to help the other peoples of the world. We are attempting it in the same way that a successful father turns out a spoiled son, by giving him everything instead of letting him earn it.

The only real progress any nation will achieve begins within itself. Any nation adopting the concepts which made our country great will throw off their caste systems, their sacred fetishes, their cartel systems and free the talents of their people. They will then take the same hard road that our people took and in time will become the nations of the future.

Toward this end we should be wholly willing to help; provided that we, in the meantime, restore our own health and vigor by returning to our tradition of freedom to achieve, by again believing in ourselves and in our pride of independence.

A Spy Is a Spy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted, I present the text of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 23, 1961. In doing so I wish to again emphatically state that, in my opinion, based upon about 14 years of active membership in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this is no time in the history of our beloved Nation for any person or persons to sanction or to commit any act

which is designed to weaken the internal security of our Nation or to contribute to the lessening of our national security against either domestic or international subversive Soviet communism.

Mr. Speaker, in making these remarks, I would like to state specifically that at this time, in my judgment, it would be increasingly hazardous to in any way lessen the effectiveness of the FBI, the Senate Internal Security Committee, or the House Un-American Activities Committee or the availability of their respective programs to our people. The work of these three great security agencies, as we all know, is specifically designed for and dedicated to the protection of our beloved country against a spy or any group of spies who are deliberately, actively, and subversively betraying their adopted country—the United States of America.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

A SPY IS A SPY

Federal District Judge William B. Herlands has taken a justifiably stern view of the wartime espionage operations of the convicted Soviet spy, Dr. Robert Soblen. Refusing leniency despite Dr. Soblen's plea that he is suffering from lymphatic leukemia, a usually fatal malady, Judge Herlands said in New York district court: "A spy is a spy, no matter what his health may be."

The judge was mindful of the fact that the evidence had proved that Dr. Soblen, a naturalized Lithuanian who became a supervising psychiatrist in a New York State hospital, had played an important role in a Russian spy ring which sent vital military secrets to Moscow during World War II. Included in the stolen information were data concerning the secret activities of the Office of Strategic Services, our supersecret wartime intelligence agency. As Judge Herlands commented in sentencing Dr. Soblen to life imprisonment, a plot in wartime to give military information to a foreign power could imperil the lives of all Americans.

Dr. Soblen was convicted partly on the testimony of his brother, Jack Soble (the original spelling of the family name), who had pleaded guilty to espionage earlier and had been sent to prison. Why these men from Lithuania, a land seized by the Russians and converted into a Soviet satellite, could be induced to spy for a nation which had robbed their country of its liberty is something not explained. But the fact is that they did betray their adopted country and, in so doing, may have imperiled the lives of all Americans. Leniency in such cases would be out of the question.

Results of U.S. Aid to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the millions of dollars which are being requested by the administration to aid distressed areas in the United States, I think the following New York Times article of July 13, 1961, will serve to illuminate further the absurdity of some of our foreign aid programs. With many thousands of people unemployed

in this country, taxes and Government spending almost at the breaking point, and free nations looking to the United States for help, we are not only using American-made goods to further entrench the Communist dictators, but, as this clipping points out, dealing with the same crew of Red leaders who today praise United States-Polish technical co-operation and tomorrow will be again denouncing us.

The opening of this steel plant, which, according to this article, presented a rare opportunity to direct public attention to U.S. economic aid to Poland, offers a most cogent example of the complete inability of the United States to get its message across to the people of the captive nations. While we gratefully accept the occasional token recognition of our aid, we totally ignore the fact that sending this aid to our ideological enemies does not win respect, but ridicule, for our naivete. Our aid does not help the people held in the grip of Communist slavery.

How many stories such as this must we read before we stop behaving like an indulgent rich uncle and begin facing the economic and political facts of life?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article from the New York Times, July 13, 1961, in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time:

GOOD WILL MARKS FETE IN POLAND AS U.S. ENVOY OPENS PROJECT—BEAM, AT NOWA HUTA STEEL PLANT, SNIPS RIBBON TO START UP PRODUCTION LINE PROVIDED WITH U.S. CREDITS

(By Arthur J. Olson)

NOWA HUTA, POLAND, July 12.—In one of the sunnier moments in recent Polish-United States relations, Ambassador Jacob D. Beam ceremonially opened today a new production line at the big Lenin Steel Works here.

The new facility, a continuous steel galvanizing line, was financed with a \$2,500,000 credit from the United States. The equipment is American made.

In an unusual gesture of official good will, Ambassador Beam was flown to this new city, outside Cracow, under the auspices of the Polish Foreign Ministry to snip a white acetate ribbon stretched in front of the gleaming new machinery.

Piotr Jaroszewicz, acting Premier during a visit of Premier Jozef Cyrankiewicz in Outer Mongolia, was on hand to praise United States-Polish "technical and economic cooperation" and to express hope for more of it.

DENOUNCED KENNEDY EARLIER

Three months ago, M. Jaroszewicz was the chief speaker at an anti-United States rally in Warsaw during which he denounced President Kennedy as "hypocritical."

Since then Poland has opened negotiations in Washington for \$180 million worth of surplus farm products and for \$5 million in industrial credit.

The ceremony gave Mr. Beam one of his rare opportunities to direct public attention to United States economic aid to Poland, which has been under way since 1956. This aid has reached a total of \$426 million.

The galvanizing line, designed and manufactured in Pittsburgh and installed here under supervision of American technicians, is "a demonstration of Polish-American economic cooperation," Mr. Beam said.

POLE PRAISES EQUIPMENT

The official reply was delivered by Miroslaw Kalm, Deputy Minister of Heavy Industry. He praised the valuable American

equipment, which, "to a large extent, meets our urgent needs."

The 1,000 tons of machinery that went into the 500-foot-long galvanizing line represent the only United States contribution to Communist Poland's development of heavy industry. Of the Lenin plant's 200,000 tons of machinery, 110,000 tons were delivered by the Soviet Union. Most of the remainder was produced in Poland.

Nowa Huta, which was 2 square miles of farmland a decade ago, will turn out 2 million tons of steel this year. Its goal is 3,500,000 tons capacity by 1965.

The Peace Corps Splices Idealism to Practicality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Peace Corps Splices Idealism to Practicality," from the June 4 issue of the Louisville Courier Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE CORPS SPLICES IDEALISM TO PRACTICALITY

The Peace Corps has reached the point of asking Congress for its first appropriation. The sum is \$40 million for the first fiscal year. President Kennedy says that from 500 to 1,000 volunteers will go overseas before the end of 1961, with numbers increasing later.

Corps Director Sargent Shriver and his advisers have already managed to allay sincere doubts on several major points.

1. The Corps will start on a small scale, with the volunteers carefully screened and only the most useful accepted. Those sent to overseas areas will have to demonstrate that they have strong bodies, alert minds, and stable personalities. As one official spokesman said recently at Indiana University: "We do not intend to send starry-eyed young people out to spread vague nostrums of good will."

2. The examinations now being given to volunteers are well designed. They bring out not only practical skills but attitudes of mind.

3. It has been positively established that Corps men will only go where they are requested. The first unit will help build roads in Tanganyika, a hopeful African country on the brink of nationhood. Another will aid small farmers in Colombia. Nigeria has offered a rural school as a training center, and has indicated that it wants "all the Peace Corps men we can get." Thus the pattern emerges.

4. The idea that the Corps might become a sort of college house party overseas has been dispelled. The labor unions are working with Mr. Shriver to channel young union technicians into the program, whose skills are urgently needed. The pay has been set at a sacrificial level. Conditions of life in the Corps camps will be austere.

5. Plans have been worked out with J. Edgar Hoover to screen all applicants, so that possible Communist infiltrators will be eliminated.

The Peace Corps is showing its vitality in the enemies it makes. Soviet authorities have denounced it as a "crafty plot of Amer-

ican imperialists." A gathering of far-left African leaders in Cairo warned that the youthful Corps men would be spies and saboteurs. But non-Communist opinion abroad is warming toward the Corps.

The proof of the Peace Corps must yet be shown in its actual operations overseas. There still are serious problems to be solved, including those created for young Americans by difficult climate and unfamiliar diet. But the planning has been impressively practical.

If the program can be made to work as now appears likely, it will serve several worthwhile purposes at once. It will offer a constructive outlet for the idealism of young Americans, now often frustrated and soured into cynicism; it will give help to nations striving to achieve economic as well as political independence; and it will serve as a useful training ground for members of our own career Foreign Service. On all counts the Peace Corps deserves a green light from Congress.

Come and Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday, August 21 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A6541, I inserted a sermon in which the minister raised some rather pertinent questions. His theme—"The Soft American"—and who is there who would deny that because of a paternalistic government, far too many are becoming just that.

In his concluding remarks the minister drew a corollary between the eagle and the oyster. The oyster was probably the first living creature that was given economic and social security. God placed the oyster in a shell to protect it from its enemies. It never moves, simply lies still, opens its shell and food floats in.

That same Creator gave us the eagle, a bird of great strength—with a graceful figure, keenness of vision and powers of flight, which does not wait for its food to float by but goes to the highest peak, builds its own home, rears its family under severe handicaps, goes in search of food, fights for it, if need be, is not deterred by rain and storm, heat or cold, always tending toward complete independence.

When our forefathers decided on an emblem to symbolize the strength of the United States, they wisely chose the eagle than the oyster.

Are we not today developing a race of oysters rather than one of eagles, a race willing to sit back in its easy chair, relax and each time sufficient energy is generated, proclaim in a loud voice—"the world owes me a living"?

The editorial which follows appeared in the August 24 issue of the Wall Street Journal and it, too, is concerned with the question of oysters or eagles. That is a choice that inevitably must be made:

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

"This is 1 year people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of their cotton, because we ain't going to do it."

Speaking from his rocking chair is a citizen of Corsicana, Tex., and his words ought to go down as one of the more memorable remarks of the year. And in his observation, reported in a page 1 story this morning, we think the gentleman from Texas is showing one of the chief attributes of intelligence, adjusting sensibly to one's environment. He ain't going to hoe because there ain't no need to.

Without stirring from his chair, save once a month on a Tuesday morning, he can stock his larder with flour, cornmeal, rice and butter, and even feed his family with fancier fare, including peanut butter, oatmeal, beans, eggs, and meat. He hasn't struck oil; he's just found a gusher in the Federal surplus food disposal program.

So no longer is the man with the hoe bent with burdens; they have been transferred to others who must pay the taxes to provide him with his pork and beans. And for the life of us, we can't avoid a certain admiration for him and the others like him.

There are a good many others like him, as our reporter found out. Since the administration in Washington broadened the menu of the Federal food program the number of people taking advantage of it has skyrocketed. Last June when the country was suffering from a recession there were some 3.3 million people on the public food rolls. At the end of June this year the number had almost doubled, to 6.2 million people.

Since Washington broadened the free food program the number of recipients in Illinois has jumped from 63,000 to 90,000 betwixt January and June; from 70,000 to 118,000 in Indiana; in North Carolina from 1,000 to 147,000. And all this during a period in which, as Washington reminds us, we are climbing out of the recession.

No doubt there are, among these millions, many who are in true need. But nowadays need is something it is not nice to inquire about; it might embarrass men with pride. So men with no pride, but with sense enough to know a good thing when they see it, can have a field day without ever tilling the fields.

In New York City, for example, people load up with free food and use their money to carry it home in a taxi. In Corsicana, Tex., they cause traffic jams driving to the food office in their automobiles. So, not surprisingly, the local grocer finds his sales of staple foods off 10 percent since the Government started offering pork-and-beans to all comers. But the same customers boom his sales of cigarettes, soft drinks, cake mixes, and candy—which is not surprising either.

Nor is it surprising that the cost of all this has also skyrocketed. In the first 6 months of this year the Federal Government quadrupled the cost of the program over the like period in 1960; at \$139 million for the whole fiscal year the total is the highest in the 25 years of the program, which reaches back into the years of the great depression. And in Washington, officials say they "see no reason to believe" the cost will go anyway but up.

For all a man has to do, in most communities, is say he needs food and the Government will give it to him. There is no need for anyone to be amazed at men—from Corsicana, Tex., to Newburgh, N.Y.—who see no need to work when they can eat without working. Lazy people are not fools.

So before you start berating the man who threw away the hoe, ask yourself a question: Who is the more intelligent? The man, like yourself, who works hard, pays taxes, and lets the politicians pass around the bounty? Or the man with emptiness in his face who sits back and enjoys the bounty in his rocking chair?

Senator Humphrey Is the Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the Los Angeles Times carried a feature story about HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the senior Senator from my State of Minnesota. Those of us from Minnesota are all proud of the Senator and our praise of him has been heard often over many years. We welcome the words of Mr. Holmes Alexander, of the Los Angeles Times, because he says in a direct and effective way what Senator HUMPHREY's friends in Minnesota have been saying and feel so deeply. Under unanimous consent I insert excerpts of this fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SENATOR HUMPHREY IS THE CHAMPION

(By Holmes Alexander)

Some future Gibbon, when he describes the decline and even, alas, records the fall of the American Republic, will have reason to write that the great Senators of the period were the "naysayers," the "slower-uppers," the "turner-backers."

But while "woe criers," and disciplinarians are the need of the times, they aren't what makes the horses pull the buggy. When you search for the Senator of 1961, you must ask: Who makes the Senate go? Who is the humming, high-powered transmission line from the White House to the upper chambers? Who is Mr. Big now that LYNDON JOHNSON has gone to the Vice Presidency?

Put these questions in this manner, and the regulars of the Senate press gallery, I think, would come very close to answering in unison. Although MIKE MANSFIELD is majority leader, and could win practically any vote of popularity and confidence, the well nigh indisputable winner of Senator of the Year title would go to HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Anybody is entitled to his personal opinion about the causes for HUMPHREY's astonishing emergence. He has risen from the social Senate ostracism of 10 years ago, the tiresome rabble-rousing of 5 years ago, and the mortifying defeat for presidential honors last year, to true eminence in the world's snootiest and most jealous circle.

Some will tell you that his success is a payoff for HUMPHREY's what-makes-Sammy-run exertions in his own behalf. Others give the overworked explanation that HUMPHREY is a mellowed radical—keeping most of his friends on the left, welcomed by new friends of the right and center. You can hear it said that he is a parliamentary accident—filling the void created by JOHNSON's departure.

My own diagnosis being that of an observer rather than a friend and admirer, is synthesized by the Senator's middle name and its literary connotation. In the world that Horatio Alger wrote about, virtue always won, honest, endeavor was rewarded, the kind heart received the recompense of warm friendship and helping hands up the ladder.

Well, HUMPHREY has led a blameless public life. His industry is stupendous. His loving kindness is undeniable. I first conceived of him as Senator of the Year when I saw him take the floor this winter to pull a couple of angry Democrats off MIKE MANSFIELD's back.

Later he inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column of mine about John Nagle,

the blind pusher of programs for the blind. Earlier this month I was in the gallery when HUMPHREY delivered a scathing speech against the disgraceful conditions in the Freedmen's Hospital in Washington.

In an election year, acts of kindness by politicians are suspect. Perhaps the best testament to HUMPHREY's sincerity is that his enthusiasms of 1960, when he was a candidate first for President and then for Senator, are unabated in 1961.

For example peace and disarmament are campaign banalities, and last year HUMPHREY almost never stopped talking about these and the domestic demagogueries of something-for-everybody. But today, with a new 6-year Senate term and with a long-lease tenant in the White House, HUMPHREY babbles on—as if he meant every word of the campaign oratory, a perishable product by most men's standards.

Finally, HUMPHREY's most winning trait in the book I keep on politicians is his good sportsmanship. I saw him mauled last year in West Virginia by the merciless Kennedy gang. At the Democratic Convention, HUMPHREY dramatized his estimation of John Kennedy by coming out for Adlai Stevenson with no hope of having a winner.

Yet, in the campaign, HUMPHREY turned his back on many Minnesota followers who expressed detestation of Kennedy's religion. And in the Senate, no Member rises more quickly, more effectively, more knowledgeably, to the President's defense than HUBERT HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY is, by these criteria and a wide margin, Senator of 1961.

Kremlin's Crisis Program for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the long term Communist attack on this country—on our internal life as well as our international position—is often minimized by many well-meaning people in the United States. Because a view from outside the country can be especially useful in this situation I want to share with my colleagues an excellent article appearing in the Evening Star of August 22:

KREMLIN'S CRISES PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES: SWISS OBSERVER SEES REDS PLANNING TO COMBINE DOMESTIC, WORLD TROUBLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—I once remarked to a Swiss friend who has spent many years in America that I thought I would like to live in Zurich on the shores of the beautiful Zurichsee. "The lake is pretty to look at, but you'd be bored to death," my friend answered.

It is true that life in Switzerland can be dull. The Swiss are, by and large, stolid, unimaginative (in our meaning of the word) and uninteresting. But they live by the code of commonsense, have a passion for independence and a fierce love for their country. They are uncluttered with experimental intellectual thinking and cling with religious fervor to their constitution, which has prevented them from falling into the claptrap of international adventures.

They have learned that they cannot afford the luxury of playing with deceiving ideologies or wishful thinking like so many big businessmen in the free world. That is why government and business are completely separated.

This came strongly to mind as I discussed the present world crises with one of the most prosperous manufacturers in Switzerland whose interests are spread to the Middle East, the United States and England. His blunt language also strongly reminded me of the fact that we in America no longer speak of certain truths lest they be impolite, undiplomatic or controversial. Because of the wealth of information he is gathering from his representatives around the world it is interesting to sum up his philosophy.

"We Swiss," he said, "have been prepared for the present trouble since the end of the last war. We have done this because we do not fool ourselves that there will be peace in the world for a long time. We are perfectly sure there will be no annihilation of nations by nuclear war—for this is a war of wits. Lenin, Stalin, and now Khrushchev have predicated the success of their efforts to that end, not on military or nuclear adventures.

"Contrary to the belief of the Kremlin, we also feel perfectly sure that a revolution will bring to an end the Communist conspiracy all over the world. But this will not happen until there have been great upheavals everywhere.

"The key is, of course, the United States. There was a time when Washington could have prevented the upheaval, but now I fear it is too late. However, though it was the weak policies of the United States which brought on the present world conditions, the victory of the free world will be led by America.

"The trouble has been that over the last 30 years you have had four very fine men as Presidents, not one of whom has understood the Communist conspiracy. And not one of them has realized that it was not they who guided the destiny of America and indirectly the world, but those who have ensconced themselves in permanent niches in your political life. The changes in administration merely means a reshuffling of positions as far as they are concerned. Many of these once actually believed that if the United States gave proof of its friendship to Soviet Russia it would be reciprocated. When this did not happen, they became stubborn and now they believe that a sugar-coated form of appeasement is the only course to insure peace. You can find them in the executive as well as legislative branches of your Government in Washington.

"The world revolution already is beginning its last phase—just as the statement of the 81 Communist Parties declared in Moscow in December 1960. The most recent phase is to combine, for the first time, internal domestic strife and crises in the nations of the free world, with international crises. This is for the purpose of throwing the free government off keel. In your country, for instance, the hidden Communists have been able by remote control to stir up racial strife which every day is becoming more acute and more dangerous to your domestic tranquility.

"And again, by remote control, the hidden Communists have been able to influence your educational system, or rather to experiment with it. The result is that many of your children no longer have reverence for God, country, and parents. The present highest rate in the world of juvenile delinquency and crimes in America is not in the American character—the minds of your youths have been infected.

"While continental Europe—especially we in Switzerland and Germany—are free of labor strife, you and the British are beset with strikes in many key industries. Your

people are literally dizzy with troubles, and the cure for everything from Communist inroads in foreign countries to business slumps is found by you in 'more government.' Europeans, who know of your economic troubles, are aghast at the billions you allocate so lightheartedly, both overseas and at home.

"Your Government seems to believe that American greatness is shown in accepting endless insults. Take the case of Cuba. Russia has taken advantage of your mistakes and has created an enemy country within 90 miles of your shores. For years Cuba was your staunch friend. Overnight it became an enemy base. The United States, which fought World War II, starting almost totally unarmed, and ending up by smashing the Nazi hordes and the Japanese warlords, could not prevent a small gang of Lenin school-trained guerrillas from taking over the island.

"Now Castro has discovered he can rob Americans of their property and insult your President with impunity. With Cuba as the test, the Soviets feel that they will not be hindered in other areas of your hemisphere.

"It is in the cards that under guidance and support of the Communists, your country will be harassed with all kinds of crises. You can be sure more disturbances will be forthcoming. Student riots and demonstrations will increase, also racial riots. And surely, there will be other new provocations skillfully and methodically planned by Moscow."

St. George Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. George, Utah, is celebrating its centennial this week under the able guidance of General Chairman Attorney Lang Foremaster and Cochairmen Vernon Worthen and Mrs. John J. Phoenix. These respected civic leaders, with the combined assistance of many, have devoted untold energies toward organizing a program of religious observance and social activities that will warm the hearts of the residents, former residents and visitors who have come to St. George for this occasion.

Unfortunately the press of legislative business in our homestretch adjournment schedule prevents me from accepting the thoughtful invitation of Mayor William A. Barlocker but I would like to participate in the festivities by word of commendation and proper observance today for the descendants of these brave pioneers who answered Brigham Young's call to the Dixie Cotton Mission 100 years ago. Many of the missionaries chosen for the new colonization had just established their homes in the Great Salt Lake Valley. It was difficult for them to leave their cultivated lands and meager comforts for the uncertainty of conquering southern Utah.

Two apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Orson Pratt and Erastus Snow were chosen to head the mission of 300 families, many of them Swiss emigrants, in search of a climate favorable to raising cash crops

and also to develop a chain of cities south of the "Rim of the Basin" to California. It was here that Erastus Snow enhanced his reputation of being second only to President Young as a colonizer and a leader of men. The Saints had confidence in his wisdom and judgment and later confirmed their trust by electing him their first State senator representing Washington, Beaver, Iron, and Kane Counties.

Orson Pratt, student, scholar and outstanding leader of the Mormon Church became the first postmaster of St. George which, incidentally, was established on March 1, 1862, less than 4 months after the arrival of the pioneers.

Titanic as these men were in the history of Utah and forceful as their leadership and contributions proved to the establishment of St. George, I believe equal credit rightfully belongs to the Mormon women who also tilled the alkaline soil, fought the grasshopper infestation, endured the heat and sand, withstood the dangers of Indian attack, and faced the hardships of frontier life with faith and courage.

The desperate circumstances of the young wife in the frontier days is illustrated in a story of a young woman who told her husband that if he could find just one flower fit to wear on a lady's dress, she would try to be satisfied. In the spring, the story goes, he presented her with a beautiful bouquet of orchid-colored sego lilies which more than answered her challenge. The sego lily is now abundant and beautiful in St. George and is regarded especially by Utahans who have adopted it as the official State flower.

Despite their unceasing labors and ingenuity, the pioneer women of St. George could offer only bran for the first Christmas dinner. The only flour they had was what they brought with them and their normal diet ranged from molasses made from beets to wild spinach, pig weed or perhaps yucca soup.

The most perplexing difficulty that challenged and defied the frontiersmen of St. George was the problem common to all settlers in Utah—water, or the lack of water.

I doubt, however, that the early settlers of St. George would agree with me that there was any lack of water that first year when they were deluged for 40 days and nights with rain that succeeded in wiping out the unembellished colonization they had established. But it was this disaster that focused the combined intelligence of the saints toward a solution and it is significant to note that the fundamental precept of western water law—water rights established by beneficial use—stems from our early Mormon pioneers.

In the early days of colonization of Utah, Brigham Young said, "No man has a right to waste one drop of water that another man can turn into bread."

Thus, the principle was laid down that water belongs to the people and no man can gain title to more than he can use in a beneficial manner.

I am indebted to one of southern Utah's pioneer stalwarts, the late William R. Palmer, for an account of early

water troubles in Utah and the gradual evolution of a law for their administration. Mr. Palmer was a bishop and stake president in Cedar City and an author and historian as well.

Writing in the reclamation era in Utah's centennial year of 1947, Bishop Palmer recalled that a William Edwards had a full-day water right in a Paragonah field. He subsequently acquired a piece of dry land a mile away and attempted to transfer his water right to the new field.

A neighbor protested that he followed Edwards in use of the water and it would cost him an hour of his water simply to turn the flow back into a dry ditch and also that the dry ditch would soak up a lot of water.

The dispute finally reached that great arbitrator of early Mormon history, the bishop's court, which found that Edwards could not take the water from the field in which it was allocated without injury and loss to all water users in the same canal. Edwards appealed to the high council court which affirmed the bishop's court decision. Years later the dispute was taken to the civil county court which again affirmed the decision of the pioneer bishop's court.

Thus, the early bishops of the church can be said to have laid down many of the precepts on which our present water laws are based.

One hundred years of progress is being commemorated in St. George this week and, along with many other credits, rapid advances toward the solution of the water problem are to be noted—from the original St. George Rio Virgin Canal to the present-day Dixie project.

The Bureau of Reclamation has now completed plans for the multipurpose Dixie project which would provide supplemental irrigation water to 9,445 acres of presently developed land and provide a full water supply for 11,615 acres of new land.

The city of St. George would be provided with 5,000 acre-feet of water annually for domestic purposes from the Virgin City Reservoir. Construction of the three powerplants as a part of the project plan would produce about 44,500,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electric energy and about 1,900,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy for sale annually. In addition, minor flood control benefits would result as would fish and wildlife and recreation benefits.

The regional director's proposed report on this potential project is now being reviewed on an informal basis by the States of Utah, Arizona, and Nevada; field offices of Federal agencies, and other affected local interests. Following consideration of comments resulting from these reviews, the regional director will submit his final report to the Commissioner of Reclamation here in Washington for further processing as required by law and interagency agreement.

I have an abiding concern and sensitive interest in the water problems of the Dixie Mission and look forward to the privilege of guiding the authorizing legislation for the Dixie project through the House of Representatives next year.

This would be a satisfying contribution to the memory of those valiant and dedicated Mormon pioneers who by the sweat of their brow established the community of St. George and left a noble heritage of unmistakable fame.

Edward R. Murrow: Out of Depth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when Edward R. Murrow was chosen to head the U.S. Information Agency, the intellectual smart set thought that the millennial day had arrived. The following articles—by Robert C. Ruark, which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun, August 25, and by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, on August 24—indicate that the Agency needs something more than a cigarette held between the second and third fingers, to be effective.

OLD FILM IMAGE WON'T FADE OUT

(By Robert C. Ruark)

Mr. Edward Murrow, a sad-seeming chain-smoker with a warty voice which first made him famous for breathing drama into a routine dateline, "This—Is London," during the blitz of an ancient war against our present gallant allies, has not experienced the smoothest sailing since he quit CBS to head up the U.S. Information Agency.

He slipped badly when he attempted to smother a documentary on migrant workers, in which the voice was his commercial own before he took up Government toll. He tried to keep the film off Britain's TV with some rather ill-advised pressure phone calls, and wound up looking even more lugubrious than usual.

Now Mr. Murrow is worried about mounting criticism of the fact that American films, both cinema and TV, which are resold for the foreign market, put entirely too much weight on gangsters, gunslingers, depraved private peepers, and teenage violence, as normal parcel to the American scene.

In other words, we are giving America a bad name by showing the outside world some tough truths about America, such as race riots, examples of discrimination in the South, and of course the classic fruitpicker odyssey over which Mr. Murrow was vocally indignant on the judiciously cut film when he was still earning his bread from CBS.

I have been hearing this sad, old song for many a weary year. Everybody—by "everybody" I mean the loose phrase which is used to express inexact opinion—everybody knows that the whole world identifies America by the old Hollywood product, instead of by some of the creakingly dull uplift projects offered by such agencies as the one for which Mr. Murrow currently fronts.

Anyone in his right mind knows that all Americans are a prototypical mixture of gangsters, as portrayed by the late Bogart and Edward G. Robinson and Paul Muni; of naughty girls, as played by Clara Bow; of downright bad girls, as sometimes acted by Bette Davis, Mae West, the late Jean Harlow and maybe even Theda Bara; of sirens as shown by Marilyn and a baker's dozen of others; of nice young men as delivered by the young Jimmy Stewart; of belt-'em-in-the-puss heroes of the Gable and Cagney

stamp; and of noble cowpokes, such as the late and much lamented Coop with his "yup."

There was nothing much wrong with it then, and no more wrong with it now. Everyone knows that there are only three cities in America—Hollywood, New York, and Miami. Everyone knows that all Americans are rich. Everyone knows that there are gangsters behind every bush, and that the way to the heart of a winsome maid is to bash her in the kisser with half a grapefruit. This—is America.

We have no poor in America, unless they are written by Steinbeck and deal with Okies; we have no race problem unless Sidney Poitier plays in it. Crooked cops meet sticky ends instead of winding up with blocks of apartment houses, and until recent sensitivity set in, our hoods were Sicilian exports. Newspapermen wear their hats turned up in front and constantly enjoin somebody on the other end of the phone to hold the presses and rip apart the front page.

Mamma mia. To attempt by awkward channeling to change the image is almost as stupid as our pitiful whining efforts to make all the world love us.

I have seen some rare dogs in American films, but I have seen some even more classic canines in some of the foreign films which play the art houses and occasionally make the big popcorn palaces. I wish Mr. Murrow would go back to CBS, where, at least, he seemed at home, because he is giving me an uneasy impression of a radio announcer out of his depth, and we wouldn't want the world to think that, would we.

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well thought out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The overseas broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But, above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called "the public relations of the United States."

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able

to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by short-wave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the overseas service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes sophistication. Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio than the phraseology and big words of over-condensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the Midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communications in foreign policy needs a new look.

Time for United States To Rouse Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following column by Mr. Constantine Brown that appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Saturday, August 26, 1961.

The indicated column follows:

TIME FOR UNITED STATES TO ROUSE ITSELF—SWISS OBSERVER SEES RED NET TIGHTEN IN CARIBBEAN, SOUTH AMERICA, CANADA

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Here again are further views, prophecies and comments of my Swiss industrialist friend who was in a mood to pull no punches—which is a Swiss characteristic.

To listen to such candid views, to hear discussed subjects which many in the United States tend to pass over because of their ugliness, was both unpleasantly refreshing, gripping, and at the same time offering hope for peace in the normal sense of the word.

"Pouring millions and millions of dollars into South America is not the answer to the problem there. As long as South Americans can watch Fidel Castro, from his little island, spit in the face of the great Nation to the north, they will conclude that Washington cannot prevent Communist inroads in the Southern Hemisphere, statements of tife politicians notwithstanding. A Castro could suddenly appear in the midst of any one of them and the United States could do nothing to stop him.

"And you seem to be blind to the subtle—or not so subtle—takeover of the Caribbean. If you study the political situation of the bordering countries and possessions along with your map this becomes quite clear. Begin with Mexico, then trace a line through Central America to Panama, the Canal Zone, Colombia, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Haiti. Next comes Panama and then Hispaniola. If you do not awaken to this danger in time, the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean will become known as the Western Red Sea.

"To your north is your historic good neighbor, Canada, with its 3,000-mile border. You have paid little attention to this friendly ally. Yet, the Communists are already saying 'Canada needs another Castro,' and claim that there will be 'another Cuba' there within a few years. Still you go casually along as though no such thought had entered the Kremlin's plans.

"Even further north is the North Pole. Over the years your great American explorers discovered valuable areas and proudly planted the American flag. Now you have signed away these valuable territories in international agreements which include Soviet Russia. No one for a moment would believe that Moscow would honor these agreements. The Reds are this very day planning control of the entire Arctic with its intercontinental airways, weather stations, etc.

"Indeed, the net is being gathered around the Soviet's main target, the United States.

"You remind me that I have said nothing about the Berlin crisis. But in the overall picture, Berlin is just another crisis. When that issue is over there will be another, inspired by the Kremlin and just as important. One of the methods of the Reds in their world revolution is to keep their opponents crisis ridden. From all indications and intelligence in our possession there will be a summit negotiation. The free world will not win the issue but it may obtain a semblance of a Kremlin retreat. This, however, will not be a temporary matter as far as Moscow is concerned. The Soviets will begin immediately to gather their political forces for another crisis and perhaps Berlin will not be the selected target for the next go-round.

"I have given you some pretty gloomy pictures—but these are facts we cannot afford to ignore. However, we do see the

faint rays of the sunrise. The reports we receive here in Switzerland from America point to a great, and at long last, awakening of your people. And once your people are aroused, they attack any encroachment on their independence with fanatic energy. This brings us hope because we have been relying on the commonsense of the American citizens more than on the gyrations of your politicians. The time is coming when the American public will no longer delay after being faced with accomplished facts.

"In this event, it is my belief that neutralists around the world will take heart and courage and this will begin to filter behind the Iron Curtain countries everywhere. The Achilles heel of the Kremlin is its subjugated peoples. Should they—supported by the American people—be encouraged to rise en masse in rebellion the Communist conspiracy is doomed.

"This will be the beginning of the end of the world revolution which Marx and his successors have been striving for since 1848. Only, the victory will be ours. Brave men will take over the leaderships of the world and it will then be truly united in peace in the real meaning of the word, not the Communist's false connotation.

"I cannot emphasize too strongly that we still expect America to be the source whence comes our strength. Our only hope for the survival of free society depends on America countering the gigantic Communist plots. The commonsense and courage of the American people are the real fear of the Kremlin—not your nuclear weapons.

"From a careful analysis of all our information here in Switzerland we are convinced that there will be no war. The United States has enormous retaliatory power, and the Soviets do not want to risk destroying themselves. Neither could a devastated world bring them victory. Their aim is to conquer through internal revolutions. Now, the world revolution has begun; but victory will eventually belong to the free world."

Because the survival of his vast industrial holdings in many lands depends on it, my friend has kept a sharp eye on internal conditions in many countries. If there is trouble, what does it stem from? From Soviet inroads? From weakness of a key official? On this information depends the future of his enterprises. It is for this reason that I have passed on the words and thoughts of the Swiss industrialist.

The Best Defense Is a Good Offense— House Joint Resolution 447 Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful, as all Americans should be, for the fine work being done by the Minute Men of America. This organization is typical of the many patriotic groups in this country whose prime purpose is to awaken the people to the Communist danger now confronting us.

On Thursday, August 3, the Stuart News, published in Stuart, Fla., carried an excellent article by Francis A. Adams, director general of the Minute Men of America, Inc. Mr. Adams' words reveal

the desire on the part of the common people of this country for responsive action by our leaders in the face of the Communist enemy.

The following is the full text of the article:

**BEST DEFENSE A VIGOROUS OFFENSE, SAYS
ADAMS: RESOLUTION BEFORE CONGRESS
ASKS NATION TO RECOGNIZE WAR STATUS**
(By Francis A. Adams, director general of
the Minute Men of America, Inc.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Adams gave this address at the July 19 meeting of Stuart Rotary Club:)

"The best defense is a vigorous offense." No one has ever epitomized the value of action in shorter or better terms.

Applied to our situation today in world affairs and particularly in matters affecting its Western Hemisphere, this admonition to action, means that we in Florida should be giving our most earnest heed to the protection of our coastlines and be equally alert in seeing that our entire State is conscious of the threat of nuclear weapon attack from Cuba.

This peril is imminent.

With this stark fact in mind, it is well for us to consider the advantage that rests with the man, or the State, or the Nation, that declares in no uncertain terms the words "Don't tread on me."

We have a golden opportunity to reassert that sentiment that was first uttered in the days of 1776 when one of the typical flags under which the Colonial forces fought, bore the likeness of a coiled rattlesnake and the legend "Don't tread on me."

In the same spirit of '76, a resolution is pending in Congress calling for a declaration of war against the U.S.S.R. and its 97 satellites, setting forth that Russia is involved in a worldwide war to destroy free governments and to force its totalitarian power over all mankind.

As long as we, the United States of America, use the bland words of diplomacy and go through the fruitless motions of debate in the United Nations or in special heads of state conferences, we are helping the U.S.S.R. to gain its objective.

By passing a joint resolution the 87th Congress, now in session in Washington, D.C., would give notice to the world at large that we are fully aware of the menace that threatens our peace and happiness.

The steps that are necessary to get a joint resolution passed by Congress are now being taken through the initiative of Congressman JOHN R. PILLION of Buffalo, N.Y.

In the House of Representatives the resolution is being considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When it is brought to the floor of the House, if passed, the draft will be sent to the Senate for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and brought to the floor of the Senate. If passed, or amended the resolution would be considered by a joint committee of the House and Senate and a final draft determined upon.

This final draft would then be voted on by the Congress as a joint resolution.

All of this seems a tedious course but it safeguard all of us from the impetuous action of Congress on a matter that does not call for instant action.

While the resolution is going through the proper processes in Washington, it is the privilege and, indeed, the duty of every citizen to let his or her view be made clear to our elected representatives in the Senate and the House. This is Government of a Republic in action. It is always, "We—the people"—who have the powers to do things. We must act in our own behalf, and exercise our sovereignty by the expression of free speech.

A call has gone out for citizens in all the 50 States and the District of Columbia to

get in contact with their respective Senators and Congressmen. This is not an idle effort. It is a direct method of conveying the will of the people to their representatives to guide them in matters of legislation. In answer to that call I had the great privilege on Friday, June 29, to be in Washington, D.C., and to visit the offices of Senator SPRESSARD HOLLAND, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS. I was accorded a most cordial reception by the staffs of these Members of Congress from Florida.

In line with usual procedure the Pillion resolution is being watched by the legislative assistants of our two Senators and Congressman ROGERS of the Sixth District.

I showed the legislative assistants the draft of a letter that the Minute Men of America feel should be sent to the Governors of the 50 States calling for affirmative action on the resolution. The text of that letter states:

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR: As a loyal fellow American I urge your support of House Joint Resolution 477 which proclaims that the U.S.S.R. and 97 satellites are waging war against the United States of America.

"Will you alert citizens of your State to wire, phone, or write to their Senators and Congressmen to speak out for this rededication of our faith in free government.

"FRANCIS A. ADAMS,
Director General, the Minute Men of
America, Inc."

We are gathered here as citizens enjoying the right of free assembly.

We may take a deep impression away with us, if we note that it was by exactly this same process of open discussion that the people of the 13 Colonies declared themselves to be a new Nation.

It was bold to the point of dauntlessness for the United States of America to throw down the gage of war to Great Britain in 1776.

In our day, 185 years after our Declaration of Independence, we have a right to reaffirm our sovereignty. We must shift from the defensive and recapture the initiative. The best defense is a strong offense.

The world will be electrified by such action.

Tyrants will pause, downtrodden people will take heart and the danger of piecemeal destruction of free countries will be halted.

Words are mightier than the sword. Let us back this joint resolution. When the 87th Congress goes on record as recognizing that the U.S.S.R. is an open avowed enemy; when Congress passes a joint resolution stating this fact, we as individuals and as a Nation will be on the road to victory over those who think we are too preoccupied to fight for our cherished freedom.

Rotary of Stuart can help bring this to fruition, by sending a message to Senator HOLLAND, Senator SMATHERS, and to Congressman ROGERS.

The 10th day of July 1961, may be a memorable one for your organization.

The call is out for all loyal Americans to answer: "Here." This needs no debating. It calls for action.

Hurrah for Huntington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am bursting with pride for my hometown of Huntington, W. Va. I call attention to

the fact that a most significant event took place on Saturday night in Carnegie Hall, New York City. In the contest to choose "Miss U.S.A.," the winner was Miss Joann Odum of the fair city of Huntington, W. Va.

Miss Odum, a striking 19-year-old brunette, is a graduate of Huntington East High School and attended Marshall University. She is a stately 5 feet, 7 inches tall, and weighs 125 pounds. By winning the title of "Miss U.S.A.," Miss Odum will qualify for the competition for "Miss World" which will take place in London, England, in November.

I am particularly proud to announce this great honor to my colleagues for a number of reasons. In 1957, I was one of the judges of the "Miss Armed Forces" contest in Huntington, at which time we chose Miss Joann Odum as the winner even though she was then only a high school student. Miss Odum has poise, charm, and intelligence in addition to her striking beauty.

In addition to her other attributes, Miss Odum has a keen interest in democracy and freedom. On her own volition several years ago, she performed volunteer work in my congressional office. I would like to say to my colleagues that certainly this volunteer work contributed nothing to her winning the "Miss U.S.A." title, but I am happy to note that it did not seem to handicap Miss Odum in being chosen the winner.

I know from time to time various Members have urged that severe limitations be placed on information included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, because I have such a high regard for my friend and colleague from Missouri, the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, who has frequently cautioned us against unnecessary information in the RECORD, I personally consulted with the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman JONES, immediately prior to making these remarks. I am pleased to report that Congressman JONES wholeheartedly endorses my desire to publicize this outstanding feat performed by Miss Odum. He agrees that it is not every day that a "Miss U.S.A." is chosen from one's own hometown.

Mr. Speaker, I have frequently called attention to the fact in a series of speeches that West Virginia is being shortchanged in defense appropriations and contracts. I am proud that the selection of Miss Odum proves once again, Mr. Speaker, that West Virginia will never be shortchanged in beauty.

Brutality in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I have often remarked that many times the more complex issues of the day receive their most penetrating analysis on

the editorial pages of the smalltown newspapers. Perhaps this is true because these papers are closer to the people—and therefore are more likely to view the issues as the people view them, with clarity and simplicity, unencumbered by expert opinions. An outstanding example of this thought is an editorial in the August 22, 1961, issue of the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express. This editorial graphically illustrates the meaning of the Communist activity in Berlin—in terms which clearly convey the horror of Communist brutality. I am pleased to call this fine editorial statement to the attention of my colleagues:

BRUTALITY IN BERLIN

Imagine, if you can, what life would be like if there were a boundary line drawn across the heart of Lock Haven along Main Street and Bellefonte Avenue, or through Jersey Shore on Allegheny Street, or along Eighth Street in Renovo, with enemy soldiers on guard to keep people from passing back and forth. What kind of a life would that be? What kind of reaction would we have? How would we like it?

That is exactly what the Russians have dictated in divided Berlin.

There is one street where the sidewalks are in West Berlin and the houses looking out on that sidewalk are in East Berlin. Because their doors and windows look out on freedom, the people in those houses are being brutally dragged away, regardless of their personal preferences, their private interests, their lifetime associations, or any other humane consideration.

Because the Reds have realized that they cannot, much longer, claim to be outdistancing the West, while residents of East Berlin display their eagerness to move into that backward area, instead of rejoicing in Communist "progress", they are giving the whole world a demonstration of what a brutal and brutalizing life communism represents.

Pictures of East Germans putting up walls across the streets, to keep out "Western spies and saboteurs" should be published far and wide, in the neutral nations where the Soviets offer their claims and in the newly independent nations where they seek a chance to impose the blessings of communism. This is a job for the U.S. Information Service.

Meanwhile, however, one cannot help wondering if there is not an opportunity here, also, for a complaint to the U.N.

Is it proper behavior for peace-loving members of the U.N. to bar their territory in such warlike fashion?

If we do not find some way to bring up this matter for discussion, we shall be establishing the sad and shameful principle that, whatever the Communists can claim and fence in, that we will let them have without question.

Senate Told Moscow Attacks U.S. Anti-Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Sunday, the Nation's press serviced by our national wire services, together with our radio-television networks, gave deserved

publicity in widely read and heard reports to a startling new report just issued by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the great Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The contents of this highly newsworthy and informative report provide carefully authenticated facts which should concern every patriotic and peace-loving American citizen.

For the record, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the Associated Press report on this Senate document as it appeared in the Sunday edition of the Washington Evening Star, dated August 27, 1961. The entire Senate report can be secured from the Government Printing Office for the nominal price of 25 cents. Many citizens, I am sure, will want to order quantities of this report to circulate to students in their communities and to help alert citizens, generally, to the stealthy, surreptitious methods employed by the Communist conspiracy within our midst.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE TOLD MOSCOW ATTACKS U.S. ANTI-REDS

Senate investigators have been told that Moscow has ordered "a frontal attack" on the anti-Communist movement in the United States and has made use of agents who infiltrated the White House.

The testimony was given behind closed doors to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 11 by Edward Hunter of Port Washington, N.Y., a writer and lecturer.

The subcommittee, in making his testimony public today, described Mr. Hunter as a psychological warfare expert and as the originator of the term "brainwashing." He is the author of the book "The Black Book on Red China" which analyzed Communist techniques in changing minds.

Mr. Hunter testified that the Kremlin has set out to crush a grassroots anti-Communist movement he said has sprung up in the United States in the last couple of years.

Orders for this "Red anti-anti-Communist drive," he said, went out through a manifesto issued December 5, 1960, at the conclusion of a strategy conference of 81 Communist Parties of the world in Moscow.

"A quick Red operation is being attempted like that of a sleight-of-hand artist, to push this administration, the press, and public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States," he said.

He testified that "such operations require a new sort of agent, on which the Kremlin places its main trust nowadays," in contrast to what he described as the old-style cloak-and-dagger man who buys or steals secrets.

Mr. Hunter went on:

"Moscow simply acquired agents who mingled with the new, intellectual elite at the top on terms of equality, were sometimes members of it themselves. They infiltrated the White House and other topmost Government offices."

He gave no names, dates, or other details, but he said "the new-style, pro-Red agent has his role to influence policy stalling or frustrating it, making it fall or end up by hurting ourselves."

Mr. Hunter testified that the primary target of the anti-anti-Communist drive is the Pentagon, "specifically the program to train and alert our troops and our people to the Red techniques and the inherent evil in communism." He said the Reds have seen that "unless this program can be destroyed,

the anti-Communist movement cannot be liquidated."

Shown copies of Defense Department directives issued this year, Mr. Hunter said that in effect they warned against the use of anti-Communist films in troop training programs and marked successes for the "Red anti-anti-Communist pressure drive."

Mr. Hunter testified this campaign "won a stunning victory for itself" when Secretary of Defense McNamara said at a May 26 news conference that military officers should confine themselves to defense matters in public discussions and avoid foreign policy matters.

The subcommittee did not comment on Mr. Hunter's testimony, but said its publication had been approved unanimously.

Two Members, however, subsequently described as "outrageous" Mr. Hunter's written memorandums about some newspapers as printed in the appendix.

In general, Mr. Hunter maintained that the newspaper articles he cited bore out his prediction that there would be "a seemingly spontaneous outpouring of articles . . . that will arise all along the fringes of the communications field where the Reds have influence."

Senators Dobb, Democrat of Connecticut, and Keating, Republican of New York, issued a statement taking issue with this portion of the testimony.

"We were unaware that written memorandums of Mr. Hunter in the form of appendixes were also to be published," the two Senators said.

"In these appendixes, serious charges are made against some of our most distinguished newspapermen, including Cabell Phillips of the New York Times, Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Edward T. Foillard of the Washington Post.

"We believe that these charges are untrue and irresponsible and we consider it outrageous that they should have been published as a part of the testimony before this subcommittee."

Firmness on Berlin Does Not Increase Danger of War; It Offers Best Hope of Preventing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mower on the Berlin crisis:

BERLIN SITUATION IS NOTHING NEW BUT SAME OLD GAME OF BRINKMANSHIP

(By Edgar Ansel Mower)

No situation that involves the danger—however remote—of nuclear war can be anything but troubling. But those who speak of the fearful crisis at Berlin leave me gasping with astonishment. Just where have they been living?

The danger of nuclear war has existed since the U.S.S.R. married a nuclear bomb to a superrocket and equaled or outstripped the United States in the production of the latter. Before that no war danger existed—not in Korea or Indo China or East Europe—simply because the United States could have atomized the U.S.S.R. without suffering equivalent damage.

But since the Soviets caught up, the danger of war has been permanent—neither more nor less. The Kremlin may turn the heat up higher from time to time, may challenge the United States in Laos, Cuba, or Berlin. It may seal off East Berlin with its own divisions and East German tanks and police.

But until Mr. K. or his successor realizes that communism can never bury freedom, or unless the West supinely submits to communism, the "fearful crisis" will be permanent. Whether he shouts or whispers is of no importance so long as his basic purpose is to "bury" us.

SHOULD TALK TO APPEASERS

Actually, when President Kennedy urges the American people to be calm, he is talking to the wrong customers. Most of them are calm and 70 percent, according to the polls, believe that if Mr. K. wants a war over West Berlin, he should have it.

The President should rather direct his appeal to the appeasement-minded minority, some of them in his own administration. For they are the ones who are pleading, whining, even screaming (at times) for almost any sort of "negotiation," for "nuclear sanity," for "prudence," and in some cases, even for abandoning the West's marvelous outpost in West Berlin.

Unless he intends to follow their counsel of fear, Mr. Kennedy's job, it seems to me, is to recognize the Berlin situation for what it is: Just one more competition in brinkmanship, where neither side can afford a war—one more hand in a game of diplomatic poker. Mr. K. thinks that by the Pavlovian technique of alternating the carrot and the stick, he can bluff the West into giving him what he wants. This is not his first attempt, it will not be his last. Thus considered, it is nothing for the West to get excited about.

GOOD CHANCE

In fact, it is a great opportunity. The more Nikita shouts and raves that he "has to have" a neutral West Berlin or else, the greater his defeat when he does not get it. Mr. K. has upped the stakes to the point where his failure is going to cost him considerable. I think that communism's failure at Berlin could be the beginning of its failure everywhere. Just what more do we want?

J.F.K. does not have to prove that he can face danger. At Berlin he has a real opportunity to recover all that he lost in Cuba—and more. I cannot believe that he will pass it up merely to please less courageous Americans.

Meanwhile, if his advisers wish to prepare for some definite future by creating a disarmament agency or play at formulating "space law" for the day when communism reforms, there is little harm in either, provided that it does not deflect the administration from its basic task of winning the contest in brinkmanship.

U.S. Timidity at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when will we stop getting pushed around at Geneva? Today's editorial in the Wall Street Journal indicates the ridiculous position the Kennedy administra-

tion has placed us in, worldwide, by sending Mr. Dean, hat in hand, to plead with the Russians for consideration of the atomic test-ban treaty.

THE WEAPONS WE BRANDISH

Washington seems to be searching for responses to Soviet pressures against West Berlin, yet it has overlooked one fairly obvious move that would clearly strengthen the U.S. position. This is to break off immediately the deadlocked East-West talks on an atomic test-ban treaty.

Even if there were no Berlin crisis, the Geneva parley, now nearly 3 years old, would be pointless and perilous. Because a crucial East-West showdown is testing our will and strength, it is that much more urgent that we disengage ourselves from a web of futility.

Back in 1958, the United States assumed that a treaty could be negotiated swiftly, and so our tests were suspended without any check on what the Soviets were doing. The risk of the Soviets cheating was deemed slight. Today, it weighs heavily upon Washington, as it should. Said the administration last week: "No nation determined to protect the freedom of its people can accept this risk (of an unpoliced test ban) indefinitely."

And yet, the United States has gone back to Geneva. It is ludicrous, to say the least, for the United States to persist in what are essentially disarmament talks with the very enemy whose threats have prompted massive U.S. rearming. It is utterly self-defeating when military men warn that the refining of U.S. nuclear weapons, a key part of our Berlin preparations, is stalled by the self-imposed test suspension.

A main objection raised to breaking off the test-ban talks is that it would weaken our standing before "world opinion." Perhaps it would. But in the crisis before us, is the passing good opinion of others any substitute for a dependable nuclear arsenal? And if they should assail us on "moral" grounds, we, too, have a clear-cut moral commitment.

It is up to the United States alone to do what it must to uphold its position in Berlin. That task is most likely to succeed if the Soviets have cause to believe that we mean what we say: our words must be matched by relevant deeds. Abandonment of fake "negotiation" and announcement of U.S. nuclear-test resumption would represent one such deed. For our move would convey to the Kremlin an unmistakable desire to improve the weapons we brandish.

In the duel of the cold war, our will is only as imposing as our arms to back it up. And until we throw off the timidity that imprisons us at Geneva, our weapons and our will are equally subject to doubt.

Foreign Aid Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading newspapers in the district I represent, the Hutchinson News, carries an editorial in the August 24 issue on the subject of foreign aid which I thought the Members of this body would be interested in reading. I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID NEEDS AID

The pettishly guarding it pursestring powers by carving out of the foreign aid bill President Kennedy's requested authority to grant long-term development loans, the House of Representatives has sought to manacle Uncle Sam's hand as it reaches in friendship to fledgling nations overseas.

It has done this in a critical period when that handshake is vital.

The Senate, recognizing the immense potential of long-range development programs not dependent upon annual congressional haggling, approved the 5-year program. The House kicked it out and substituted a 1-year appropriation.

Although foreign aid, in itself, was not at issue, foreign aid opponents led in the fight against the 5-year plan. Foreign aid supporters who went along, mouthing speeches about the necessity of congressional control over each year's program, did almost as great a disservice to our national interest as if they had killed an aid bill outright.

Misuse and mishandling of assistance to other countries is a standard subject of criticism. It should be obvious that forcing year-by-year planning where long-term programs are the crying need is misuse.

We have also lamented the lack of appreciation shown for our self-interest generosity. But forcing struggling economies of new nations—at whom the program is aimed—to come hat-in-hand to Washington in hopes that programs won't be scuttled forces a strain, and humiliation, not calculated to stir more than resentment.

At a time when the foreign aid program must be both farsighted and competitive if it is to be really effective, the House is insisting on keeping it from being either.

Will the Callup of Reserve Units Deprive Us of Needed Skills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are none who would oppose calling up the men needed to maintain our military strength, if, indeed, the present crisis in Berlin demands building up our manpower. It is a tribute to the patriotism of our young Americans that they have accepted the President's call for sacrifice on their part with as little complaint as has been exhibited to date. Americans have never failed the call to duty and this generation will be no different. There is a grave question, however, in my mind as to whether or not the hurry-up call may be hurting our buildup in other ways.

From a news story in the Washington Sunday Star I quote the following excerpt. The story deals with the calling up of Naval Air Patrol Squadron 661, Anacostia Naval Air Station. I call your attention in particular to the following quote from the article:

Officials say the squadron is typical of the activated units. If it is, the communities in which the newly activated men live are losing some of their best citizens.

Squadron 661 has more degrees than men. In civilian life its members are highly trained aviation engineers, chemists, civil engineers, test pilots, lawyers, aviation de-

sign experts, missile technicians, college instructors, electronics toolers, and other highly skilled professional men.

Mr. Speaker, do we have such a surplus of highly skilled people in the very fields in which we are trying to maintain a lead over the Communist nations that we can now afford to pull these men out of civilian life? Unless we are now prepared to immediately challenge the Communist aggression, it seems to me we would be wiser to keep from depleting our manpower in technical fields where these skilled men would be serving a far more useful purpose.

Wilderness Preservation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the proposed legislation for a Wilderness Preservation System has created a great many doubts among the people of the Western States as to the wisdom of this action. I feel that while Congress has been deluged by material from many groups, some of whom have never been in any of these vast areas to be blanketed in under the proposal, not much has been heard from the people who will be most affected by the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Buhl (Idaho) Herald of August 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROVERSIAL WILDERNESS BILL

In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, John Bird writes a revealing account of "The Great Wilderness Fight." His title is no exaggeration. This battle has been shaping up for many years and now it seems to be coming to some sort of a climax. On the one side are those who would set aside vast tracts of Government-owned lands and keep them in a totally, or almost totally, wild state forever. On the other are those who would allow some degree of commercial development. And if this sounds like a more or less simple controversy, it isn't. There are a thousand-and-one attitudes toward it, so far as the details are concerned at least, and tempers grow hot when the issue arises.

A wilderness bill is before Congress. It proposes that the Nation select about 30 to 40 million acres of our most spectacular scenic and primitive lands, now in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and game ranges, to be held untouched by ax, saw, drill, or wheel into the boundless future. That about equals the land area of Illinois. And some of the lands contain valuable commercial resources, timber, water, oil, many minerals and so on. The problem seems to be how to save them from ruthless exploitation, and at the same time, if possible, make use of them to help meet our economic needs.

A word is needed here about our long-existing policy toward the national parks, which total, with monuments and other recreation areas, some 22 million acres. These are administered under a multiple-use con-

cept which means each forest or land area is managed to combine uses which are suitable to that particular land and to the public interest. For example, national forest lands may, under very strict controls, be opened to grazing, mineral development, and utilization of water for farms and industries. Opponents of the presently proposed wilderness bill, argue that it would violate the multiple-use principle. They also point out that, because of this principle, the parks bring in more than \$900 million a year to the Treasury.

Commercial exploitation of an area, properly conducted, need not be destructive. Twenty years ago 2 million acres were set aside for the moose on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska as their range. Later it was found that major oil deposits lay within it. A group of U.S. oil companies sought permission to drill. Despite protests that this would scare the moose away, permission was finally given, with the companies promising to take every care to protect the moose and their range. As it turned out, the moose weren't bothered at all. The drillers were. The animals have proved friendly and curious, and most of the herd hangs out where drilling is under way.

Numbers of authorities say that over-caution in protecting natural resources can be wasteful and destructive. Mr. Bird cites a forest consultant who told him that there are 500,000 acres of merchantable timber, which can't be touched now, in the Olympic National park, much of it without scenic value or accessibility. It is worth \$300 million but if not harvested will die of disease and insect attack.

Bird also touches on the wise conservation practices followed in the Pacific Northwest by leading timber companies, such as Weyerhaeuser and Crown Zellerbach. They look far into the future—the old "cutout and get out" days are over. Their huge "tree farms" assure that over the years, new growth will balance the cut. This is known as sustained yield logging, and amounts to a perpetual reforestation program. The recreational values of timber lands are carefully preserved and in many instances improved.

Included in the proposed controversial wilderness system bill is some 3 million acres in Idaho, much of which contains merchantable timber, and according to most competent geologists, has excellent potential for mineral deposition.

Another significant aspect of the bill is that restrictions on road building in some of these areas makes the fighting of fires more difficult. On two occasions in recent weeks, fighting of fires has been made more difficult in Idaho's primitive areas because of inaccessibility to the fire areas except by air which proved inadequate. The deep freeze in which some of Idaho's timberland would be placed as a result of the bill would eventually do greater harm than wise multiple use development of the areas.

The So-Called Compromise on the Hanford Electric Powerplant Issue—A Challenge to the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ZAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 28, I mailed the follow-

ing letter and statement to each Member of the House of Representatives regarding the so-called compromise proposed by the proponents of the Hanford Electric Powerplant issue.

The letter and statement are self-explanatory and reveal that the so-called compromise suggested by the supporters of the Hanford Electric Powerplant would be nothing less than complete capitulation by the House of Representatives which has already rejected the project on three different occasions.

The so-called compromise suggested by the proponents of the Hanford Electric Powerplant is nothing more than the authorization of the project in a piecemeal manner. Therefore, this offer to compromise, if accepted, would amount to a complete surrender by the House to the will of the Senate.

The letter and statement follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1961.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: There have been increasing reports that a so-called compromise will be offered in the AEC authorization conference for the addition of one unit of 400,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity at Hanford at a cost of \$58 million. This proposal would, in effect, ask the House to consider a proposal which has been studied for approximately one week when the House has already expressed its opposition on three separate occasions to a proposal which had over 2 years of concentrated study.

To understand more fully why such a concession would, in effect, be a complete capitulation on the part of the House, I have attached an explanation of the shortcomings of this proposal.

Based on this analysis, I assure you that my position, which is in accordance with the instructions given to me as a member of the conference by the vote in the House of Representatives, will remain unchanged. I look upon any attempt to the Senate to restore the Hanford project in full or in part as a challenge of the sovereignty of the House. I feel confident that if it is necessary to come back to the House for further instructions the vote against Hanford will be even larger than before.

Any further delay in completing action on the AEC authorization bill will hold up legislation important to the national welfare and to individual constituencies. If such delay continues, the Senate will have to take full responsibility.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

NO REASONABLE COMPROMISE ON HANFORD— JUST COMPLETE CAPITULATION

A careful examination of the proposal to construct 400,000 rather than 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at Hanford clearly reveals that the proposal is not reasonable and in no way negates the basic premises made in the separate statement attached to the joint committee report on the AEC authorization bill and the position previously taken by the House of Representatives on three separate votes.

The following points indicate the weaknesses of such an offer of compromise:

1. The most significant point is that authorizing the 400,000 kilowatt facility at a cost of about \$58 million would be granting the Hanford proposal on the installment plan. If authorization is granted to construct a facility to utilize half the steam, regardless of cost to the Nation's taxpayers, it would be almost impossible to prevent the Government from going the next step

next year in authorizing the addition of another 400,000 kilowatt facility.

2. The construction of a 400,000 kilowatt facility would still have the effect of putting the AEC in the power business on a very large scale, even though this power supposedly would be used exclusively at the Hanford Station.

3. The economic feasibility studies of adding 800,000 kilowatts of power to Hanford reveal the proposal to be rather questionable, to say the least, based on the most optimistic assumptions which could be made. Since the estimated cost of installing one generating unit to Hanford is approximately \$10.5 million more than half the cost of the two units, an economic study of this proposal would reveal it to be very unfeasible.

4. The construction of such a unit would have the effect of releasing 400,000 kilowatts of firm power—previously supplied to Hanford—into the Bonneville system. This quantity of power would add to the present surplus and could be used by BPA to justify further the proposed Bonneville-California intertie as the first leg of an all-Federal giant power grid.

5. The construction of such a facility would not make Hanford self-sufficient in terms of power because BPA would still be required to tie into the installation to supply standby power to meet the needs of Hanford during those periods when the reactor would be shut down for any reason.

6. Every one of the 10 compelling reasons listed in the separate statement as to why the 800,000 kilowatt facility should not be constructed at Hanford would continue to be applicable. It would only be a question of the degree of applicability.

On three different occasions the House of Representatives has opposed the Hanford power project. What have been spoken of as compromises are nothing more than the authorization of the Hanford project in a piecemeal manner. This, therefore, would not be compromise but complete surrender to the will of the Senate.

National Lottery of the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of the Dominican Republic. This small nation derives great benefit from its recognition of the fact that people like to gamble.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Dominican national lottery came to \$32 million. The Government's income, some \$7 million, was not earmarked for any specific purposes but was rather applied to the general fund of the treasury.

There are only 3 million people in the Dominican Republic, which means that the average personal expenditure on the national lottery was about \$10. Per capita income in the Dominican Republic is approximately \$300. If Americans spent a similar share of their income on a national lottery, the gross receipts of such a lottery would be well in excess of \$10 billion a year. When will we wake up to this financial wisdom?

Progress and Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following two articles—one by Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Evening Star of August 24, and the other by Richard Starnes, in the New York World Telegram of August 25—indicate how President Kennedy's alliance for progress is progressing.

The President insists he must have a blank check for spending so that he can plan our Latin American policy. With one Communist in control in British Guiana, another Communist in control of Colombia's economic development, and with the recent change of government in Brazil, it would seem to me that, more than ever, Congress must annually review any funds that are to be spent.

The articles follow:

AND THIS IS PROGRESS

(By Richard Starnes)

A mysterious, half-forgotten figure who was branded a fellow in the consortium of Communist spies that operated in New Deal Washington has returned to haunt President Kennedy's alliance for progress program in Latin America.

He is Lauchlin B. Currie, former administrative assistant to FDR. Currie, now a citizen of Colombia, was frequently mentioned in congressional investigations as a tool of the Soviet spy apparatus in Washington. In 1953 the FBI named him as a procurer of government secrets for Communist spies. Elizabeth Bentley, a former courier for a Communist espionage network, testified that Currie's job was to steal White House secrets for the spy ring.

The former White House aid hotly denied all the charges under path. But in 1950 he left the country and settled in Colombia, where he became an occasional adviser to the Colombian Government. In 1955 his U.S. citizenship was revoked on the ground that Currie, a native of Nova Scotia who was naturalized here in the mid-1930's, had automatically forfeited his citizenship by remaining outside this country for 5 years.

I can find no record that Currie protested revocation of his U.S. citizenship. In 1954 he married a Colombian national, and so far as the record goes has not set foot in the United States since. The State Department, however, glumly asserted that it had "heard" Currie had been in New York recently. I have been unable to check this tid-bit of information at this writing. The State Department, of course, has ample reason for its uneasy interest in the doings of Currie, erstwhile accused catspaw of Soviet espionage and current adviser to the Government of Colombia.

Currie, for all his flagrant record in Washington, is the author of an economic development plan which is now under serious study by the Government of Colombia. If it is adopted it will become the blueprint for spending that nation's share of the multi-billion-dollar "alliance for progress" fund.

Currie's plan, according to State Department sources, is a far-out scheme for "forced draft" industrialization of Colombia. It envisions, among other things, "effective" industrialization within 2 years—a goal which experts regard as wildly unrealistic. Another aspect of Currie's blueprint involves the mass

removal of much rural population to proposed industrial areas.

Treasury Secretary Dillon, who was asked recently what safeguards the United States would have that its huge "alliance for progress" investment wouldn't be squandered on crackpot schemes, replied that much of the program would be administered through such agencies as the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank and would have to meet reasonable investment banking standards.

But the Currie case is beginning to show how difficult this concept may be to enforce. As concerned as it is over the hare-brained Currie plan, our State Department has carefully avoided making any suggestion that the Colombian Government reject it. Any representations, now, the State Department is afraid, would be misunderstood as meddling with Colombian sovereignty.

But the fact is that our officials would be in an equally embarrassing dilemma if a Latin-American government offered a crackpot blueprint in a bid for "alliance for progress" funds. If the Colombian Government, for example, adopted the Currie "forced draft" proposals, and this country then rejected them, it would be interpreted as a tremendous effort by Colombia.

Washington officials, who are frankly unhappy over the whole mess, are hoping such subtle hints as have been dropped in Bogota will be enough to torpedo the Currie scheme without damaging our relations with Colombia.

ANOTHER CASTRO OVER THE HORIZON

(By Gould Lincoln)

A would-be Castro is about to take over in British Guiana—a Communist at heart, although for the present at least as a neutralist. The question in many minds is: Where in Latin America will a third Castro-minded leader grasp power? The spread of Communist support in countries to the south of the United States is becoming more and more a vital issue. The turn toward communism in British Guiana, where Cheddi Jagan and his leftist political party has just won an election, putting them in power, was accomplished without bloody revolution. But the change has been nonetheless effective. Mr. Jagan has freely admitted in the past that he is a Marxist; he has been a great admirer of Castro and Castro's government in Cuba.

The situation for Mr. Jagan, despite his victory at the polls, is still cramping. The British still have not given the country full independence. The British still are in position to control foreign affairs. Mr. Jagan is expected to become Premier and he will have a majority in the country's legislative body. Should he seek to adopt the Russian-Sino Communist line—with nationalization of industry and political bonds with the Kremlin, a la Castro—he may find that Britain will shut down on the complete independence, which has been promised within a year or two.

Nevertheless, Jagan's victory in British Guiana is the first time an out-and-out Communist sympathizer has gained control in a century on the South American Continent. Obviously, it is giving the Kennedy administration concern. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said this Government has been consulting with the British regarding the situation. Also, British Guiana has been getting \$750,000 from the United States in technical aid—under the foreign aid program—and recently obtained a \$1.25 million loan from the World Bank. Mr. Jagan also has said he wants to participate in the \$20 billion alliance for progress program which has been sponsored by President Kennedy.

NO U.S. FUNDS FOR REDS

If Mr. Jagan puts the Communist line into practice there, Congress will never per-

mit the appropriation of any money that would go, or conceivably go—to his government. This includes appropriations for foreign aid and also money for the alliance for progress program under the plan recently signed up at the Uruguay Conference. Indeed, if Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, who represented the United States there, had not announced that the conference that none of the \$20 billion fund would go to Castro and his Cuban Government, leading members of Congress say today that body would never appropriate a dollar for the fund.

MAY PLAY WAITING GAME

The problem of the spread of communism and sympathy for the Communist cause in Latin America is increasingly forcing itself upon the American Government and the American people. This election in British Guiana has sharpened the concern felt here. Mr. Jagan may still continue to put forth reports that his government will play along with such neutralist countries as India and some of the newly independent African countries, in an effort to allay suspicion, believing that a waiting game until British Guiana has obtained its full independence from Britain is the best policy. However, his Chicago-born wife, whom he met and married while he was studying dentistry at Northwestern University and who allegedly had Communist associations, has announced that he and his government will demand immediate and complete independence for their country.

British Guiana borders on Venezuela and Brazil. It is almost on the same parallel with the Panama Canal, although some 1,200 miles distant. A Communist beachhead there, despite the small population (some 600,000 to 700,000) could eventually become a threat—just as the Communist beachhead in Cuba, 90 miles from Florida, may constitute a serious threat. Castro receives arms and economic aid from Soviet Russia. There is nothing to prevent the same kind of aid from going to British Guiana in the future. There was a period after Castro took over Cuba from Dictator Batista during which many people in this country regarded him as a good revolutionary. This feeling for Fidel Castro has vanished into thin air.

Some day the Latin-American policy of the Kennedy administration must be clarified. Except for the Kennedy proposed \$20 billion Alliance for Progress, nothing has really evolved there since the fiasco of the United States Cuban invasion. There had been talk of rallying the OAS (Organization of American States) to take action or adopt economic sanctions against Castro's Cuba. But too many leaders of Latin-American governments showed a disinclination for any such moves at this time.

McMillan in Running Battle With the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD an item written by Mr. Edward H. Sims who is head of the Sims Bureau here in Washington and who writes for a number of newspapers throughout the United States.

Mr. Sims, in my opinion, at all times makes an effort to give the people of this country the news in an unbiased manner and if we are to continue to have a

free press in the United States, we must have more editors who will refrain from giving the people slanted views of the news and discontinue using the press as a manner of smearing public officials who happen to disagree with their views on certain legislation.

The article follows:

(By Edward H. Sims)

WASHINGTON.—The National Capital, as a city, comes in for much attention by both the politicians and the newspapers of the country. This is as it should be, for the Capital—the District of Columbia—is the property of the 50 States.

Residents in the District of Columbia have not had the right to vote, until recently, when they were given the right to vote in presidential elections. Prior to this, there was constant editorial treatment of the denial of the right to vote to District citizens.

Many are still dissatisfied because residents of the District do not elect representatives to sit in Congress, and because they do not elect city officials to run the National Capital.

The man who has stood in the path of a city government in Washington, the officeholders elected by residents of the District of Columbia, is Congressman JOHN L. McMILLAN, of South Carolina. From a distinguished South Carolina family and the dean of the Palmetto State's delegation, McMILLAN is flatly opposed to the proposal to turn over the Federal City to local citizens.

"It wouldn't work," McMILLAN told this writer this week. "It has been tried before and it didn't work then."

To read the Washington newspapers, and to listen to some of the commentators and columnists, one might think that McMILLAN had four horns and shark teeth. But the fact is that he is against home rule for the District of Columbia for some pretty good reasons.

And because he has fought it, he has been often taken to task by the Washington Post, which has pumped so hard for this "pet" and which has been unable to beat McMILLAN in the long fight. In recent days McMILLAN bested the Post on two other interesting counts.

He led the fight for an amendment to the law which would close the gap in law enforcement left by the Supreme Court's Mallory ruling. That court decision hampered the Washington police severely in their efforts to check rising District of Columbia crime, by forcing them to turn loose persons picked up without the proper time to question them at length.

The District Committee of the House, headed by McMILLAN, held hearings on this question, and the senior judge in Washington, Judge Alexander Holtzof, testified in favor of the amendment. So did the U.S. District Attorney. McMILLAN—in spite of opposition from the powerful and active Washington Post, got the bill passed in the committee and in the House.

He also recently got another amendment through both the committee and the House—an amendment which would close another gap left in Washington law enforcement by Supreme Court decision. This amendment would restore the burden of having to prove insanity to the person pleading insanity. This is the general rule in courts and States all over the country.

However, the controversial Durham ruling of the Supreme Court changed that—so that in Washington today if a defendant in a rape or murder case says that at the time he must have been crazy, it is up to the State to prove that he was not.

Crime in the National Capital is reaching scandalous proportions. It is a fact that 85 percent of the serious crimes are committed

by Negroes, and that the rate of crime rises each year.

McMILLAN says: "I have never done anything to hurt the Negro in my political life. I am not against the Negro nor do I seek to do any person an injustice. But we need to help the police department in the District in every way we can and what I have done is in the best interests of everyone in the Capital, and there is no politics in it."

The Post, meanwhile, has blamed McMILLAN for helping block the nomination of a Negro, Frank Reeves, to be a commissioner in the District of Columbia. McMILLAN denies that he deserves the credit or the blame. "That was a Senate matter and I can't control things over there," he says. (Reeves' nomination seems blocked for a number of reasons.)

In summary, the fight being waged between the liberal Washington Post and McMILLAN is a long one. In this connection, McMILLAN feels the Post seizes every opportunity to knock him, both above and below the belt. To impartial observers, it's clear the newspaper considers McMILLAN a bar to its program. McMILLAN feels the newspaper is a dangerous instrument, as it is run, in the National Capital.

To this writer, it seems that McMILLAN gets the worst of every publicity and news angle carried—at any time—in the Post, which influences many people in Washington.

Summary of Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have conducted an opinion poll among the voters of the Seventh District of Indiana. The tabulation, which I now submit, will be of interest and significance to my colleagues.

Indiana voters overwhelmingly favor a strong, determined stand against Communism, whether in Berlin, Red China, Cuba, or elsewhere.

The tabulation shows that 96 percent said we should resist Communist attempts to force us out of West Berlin. Most of these replies were received before the recent border closing. Only 2 percent disapprove of such a stand and 2 percent expressed no opinion. In response to a similar question last year, 95 percent replied that we should not abandon West Berlin.

Eighty-seven percent of the replies affirm our continued opposition to United Nations' membership for Communist China. Ten percent say we should not oppose Peking's admission and 3 percent did not respond. Last year, 85 percent said the United States should not recognize Red China.

On a multiple choice question concerning Cuba, 87 percent expressed disapproval of the tractor-prisoner exchange, which was abandoned by its proponents after the questionnaire was distributed. Seventy-nine percent favor an economic embargo against Cuba and 48 percent would favor sending United States troops to displace the Castro government if necessary. Thirty-six per-

cent are opposed to sending troops and 16 percent declined to give a "yes" or "no" answer.

With regard to our foreign aid program, two-thirds of those who replied want to see it sharply reduced or ended. Forty-six percent favor cutting it sharply and 20 percent want it completely ended. Twenty-one percent favor a continuation of the program at recent levels and 6 percent believe it should be increased. The remaining 7 percent did not indicate an answer.

Seventh District voters reiterated their previous misgivings concerning Federal aid to education. Seventy percent of the replies expressed opposition to Federal aid to be used for teachers' salaries in the schools and 56 percent opposed Federal assistance for school construction. Only 23 percent expressed approval of Federally supported teachers' salaries and 40 percent backed construction aid. The balance of the replies failed to indicate their opinions.

Only 30 percent favor a program of medical care for persons over age 65 tied into the social security system. Sixty-seven percent opposed this suggestion, and 3 percent were undecided. In response to a similar question last year 36 percent were in favor and 57 percent were opposed.

There is widespread interest in tariff legislation to protect domestic industries from the competition of products

made in countries with low labor standards. Seventy-four percent supported such legislation; 21 percent were opposed and 5 percent expressed no opinion. A similar response was received on this question last year.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, the subject of some criticism in recent months, received a strong vote of confidence in the replies received. Eighty-nine percent believed it should continue its investigations, 7 percent are opposed and 4 percent did not reply.

The response to this year's questionnaire is much higher than it has been to any I have distributed in previous years. There is evidence of a growing interest among the people about the international questions which have become so threatening in recent months. Many voters amplified their replies with letters expressing their concern over the increasing aggressiveness of Khrushchev and the Communist world.

I know that many Members of the House send questionnaires to their constituents. I believe they have found, as I have, that these polls give some significant guide to voter sentiment. Beyond that I have found that they tend to encourage discussion and thinking among the citizenry about the vital questions of today. I am deeply gratified by the attention my constituents have given these questions.

The results of the poll follow:

Final summary of opinion poll conducted by Congressman William G. Bray, 7th District, Indiana

Do you favor—	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. In our relations with Cuba:			
(a) Agreeing to the tractor-prisoner exchange?	3	87	10
(b) Economic embargo on all goods?	79	10	11
(c) Sending troops to displace Castro and the Communists?	48	36	16
2. Continuing U.S. opposition to the admission of Red China in the U.N.?	87	10	3
3. Foreign-aid appropriations:			
(a) Continued at present levels?	21		7
(b) Cut sharply?	46		
(c) Expanded?	6		
(d) Ended?	20		
4. Stronger laws to protect domestic industries from competition of products imported from countries with cheap labor standards?	74	21	5
5. Increase in social security taxes to provide a compulsory Government program for medical care of persons over 65?	30	67	3
6. Continuing to resist Communist attempts to force us to withdraw from West Berlin?	96	2	2
7. Federal tax money being used to aid States in—			
(a) School construction?	40	56	4
(b) Teachers' salaries?	23	69	8
8. Permitting the Un-American Activities Committee to continue its investigations?	89	7	4

Irish Hospitals' Trust Sweepstakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the Irish hospitals' trust sweepstakes. This public enterprise, although not in a strict sense a national lottery, probably has more repercussions in the United States than any other foreign gambling operation. The Irish sweepstakes not

only benefits the Irish hospitals, but it sheds a little light on American gambling proclivities as well.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Irish sweepstakes totaled better than \$47 million. The profits accruing to the Irish hospitals exceeded \$11 million in that year.

It is all well and good that the Irish hospitals benefit from the natural urge to gamble, but why is it necessary that they benefit from the failure of the American Government to realize that Americans like to gamble? Do we have such a favorable balance of payments that we can afford to encourage the flight of gambling dollars to foreign shores? Or is this a price that the hypo-

criters are more than willing to pay in order to be able to continue to impose their will on the majority?

Millions of Credit "Dupes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the August 26, 1961, issue of the *Ave Maria*, a national Catholic weekly published in Notre Dame, Ind.

I believe that H.R. 6725, the truth-in-lending bill is the answer to the problem of hidden credit charges and urge the House to consider this proposal. It is very much in the national interest.

The article follows:

MILLIONS OF CREDIT "DUPES"

Are Americans actually paying more than they think in consumer credit charges? The Credit Union National Association believes so: "When credit granters can hide the true cost of credit, people pay excessive charges without realizing it, and economic waste and personal hardship will result."

CUNA is backing the truth-in-lending bills introduced into Congress by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER. The objective of the bills is "to assure a full disclosure of credit cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy."

According to CUNA, "Such a law would help the millions of families who are still being duped out of a full week's wages or more each year by unnecessary high consumer credit costs."

Whether or not this particular bill is the best measure to dampen the now-prospering success of loan sharks is a matter for Congress and those expert in banking and finance to decide. But it does seem that some congressional recognition of the growing problem is needed to protect American families in our affluent society. Buying has been made easy—too easy—for us. When this easy-buying is linked with values that put speedboats and Bermuda cruises in the "necessary" and "pay later" category, it is time to bring every potential buyer's attention to the real cost of these luxuries.

Families plagued with financial difficulties are insecure and unhappy families, particularly when the head of the family realizes too late that he blundered in his handling of the family treasury. Nagged by past-due bills and threatened with collection calls, households are torn by worries and doubts.

On the other hand, sensible management of even a minimum income leads to harmony and peace of mind, the good realization that what God has given has not been squandered but has been spent wisely.

If what CUNA states is true, that "millions of families" are being "duped out of a full week's wages or more each year" by hidden finance charges, it would seem that the problem is one of national scope; the security of a country depends upon the security of its individual families.

Ironically, an objector to the bill, Senator WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, expressed one of the key reasons why we think some legislation of this nature is necessary: "If stores had to say their revolving credit fund operated at 18 percent interest per year,

what would happen to good will? The customer has accepted 1½ percent a month."

Disclosure of these charges could very easily cause buyers to think twice—to stop and consider that a Bermuda cruise could also mean sailing into bankruptcy, or that the trim and speedy little boat they long for could get them into deep water in more ways than one.

Red Agents in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is the shocking story of John Chadwick, as it appeared in yesterday's *Long Island Sunday Press*, on how Red agents infiltrate the White House.

With Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's muzzling of officers within the Department of Defense to prevent enlightening of Americans on communism, is it not time we took a close look at the whole picture?

What use is it to be strong militarily when we are weak and negligent in dealing with Communist subversion?

The article follows:

RED AGENTS INFILTRATE WHITE HOUSE (By John Chadwick)

WASHINGTON.—Senate investigators have been told that Moscow has ordered "a frontal attack" on the anti-Communist movement in the United States and made use of agents who infiltrated the White House.

The testimony was given behind closed doors to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 11 by Edward Hunter of 64 Webster Avenue, Port Washington, a writer and lecturer.

The subcommittee, in making his testimony public yesterday, described Hunter as a psychological warfare expert and as the originator of the term "brainwashing."

Hunter testified that the Kremlin has set out to crush what he termed a grassroots anti-Communist movement he said has sprung up in the United States in the last couple of years.

Orders for this "Red anti-anti-Communist drive," he said, went out through manifesto issued December 5, 1960, at the conclusion of a strategy conference of 81 Communist Parties of the world in Moscow.

"A quick Red operation is being attempted, like that of a sleight-of-hand artist, to push this administration, the press, and public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States," Hunter said.

He testified that "such operations require a new sort of agent, on which the Kremlin places its main trust nowadays," in contrast to what he described as the old-style cloak-and-dagger man who buys or steals secrets. Then Hunter went on:

"Moscow simply acquired agents who mingled with the new, intellectual elite at the top on terms of equality, were sometimes members of it themselves. They infiltrated the White House and other topmost Government offices.

"These were gentlemen all. Gentlemen talked frankly between themselves in comradely manner. Secrets were much easier to steal this way, and immensely more reliable.

"We might cringe at the idea that Red agents, bought and paid for by the enemy,

had entree and became members of the White House entourage, but we can brush it out of our minds only at our own peril. As such things happened, they can happen again."

Hunter gave no names, dates, or other details in testifying about this, but he said "the new-style, pro-Red agent has his role to influence policy, stalling or frustrating it, making it fall or end up by hurting ourselves."

He testified that the primary target of the anti-anti-Communist drive is the Pentagon, "specifically the program to train and alert our troops and our people to the Red techniques and the inherent evil in communism."

Hunter said the Reds have seen that "unless this program can be destroyed, the anti-Communist movement cannot be liquidated."

Shown copies of Defense Department directives issued this year, Hunter said that in effect they warned against the use of anti-Communist films in troop training programs and marked successes for the "Red anti-anti-Communist pressure drive."

Hunter testified this campaign "won a stunning victory for itself" when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said at a May 26 news conference that military officers should confine themselves to defense matters in public discussions and avoid foreign policy matters.

At another point Hunter said "a fundamental objective of the Red drive is to cut off Pentagon participation in the (anti-Communist) grassroots movement that is at long last awakening our people."

"By forbidding the participation of the military in seminars or forums where politics and policy are discussed," he said, "anti-Communist preparedness can be torpedoed and the character-building aspects of the program can be eliminated."

He said "communism cannot be meaningfully discussed without reference to Soviet Russia, the satellites and Red aggression, and infiltration in places such as southeast Asia and Africa."

Hunter testified that prior to the Moscow manifesto of December 5, 1960, anti-anti-Communist maneuvers took the form mainly of Red fronts, hush-hush methods, and economic pressures.

But since then, he said, anti-anticommunism, "has come out into the open, taking the offensive."

"During the years of hush-hush," Hunter said, "our channels of communication, to all practical purposes, closed their pages to anti-communism, ignored or downgraded anti-Communist books and writings, neutralized or squeezed out anti-Communist editors, authors and speakers, and made the anti-Communist a socially undesirable person."

He said Moscow has now decided that it is necessary to combat the anti-Communist movement in the United States head-on.

"We shall witness a seemingly spontaneous outpouring of articles and persuasions of every character that will rise all along the fringes of the communications field where the Reds have influence and, from then on . . . penetrating all channels of the press and all attitude-changing segments of our society, such as schools and churches."

Protecting Capital of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an edi-

torial which appeared in the News and Courier, one of the leading and oldest daily newspapers not only in South Carolina, but in the South.

I hope every Member will take time to read this article as I am certain every Member realizes the pressure that I have been under during the 14 years I have been chairman of the House District Committee from certain sources here in Washington to report a home rule bill to the floor of the House.

I, of course, cannot see how the Congress can consider a bill giving home rule to the District of Columbia without first amending the Constitution. I have personally been smeared and had every underhanded tactic used on me since I have served as chairman of the House District Committee by certain members of the local press for the simple reason that I oppose this type of legislation.

The article follows:

PROTECTING CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Representative JOHN L. McMillan, of the Sixth South Carolina Congressional District, who serves on the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, unquestionably speaks for many thoughtful Americans in every State of the Union when he opposed the Kennedy administration's home rule bill for Washington.

The present form of government of the Federal District was created in 1878. It consists of a Commission of three members, two residents of the District appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and one detailed from the Army Corps of Engineers. Each House of Congress has a committee which is concerned with District affairs.

Residents of the District do not vote in national or municipal elections. It should be understood that Washington was created as a Federal town for the specific purpose of being the seat of Government. The original settlers were not stripped of rights. Moreover, any Government worker may continue to vote in his home State if he maintains a legal residence there.

The District of Columbia is not like any other community in this country. Its business is Government. Taxpayers in every part of the Nation pay the salaries of most of the working people in the District. While the commission system may not be the closest to a perfect municipal government in the Nation, it is vastly superior to the governments of many metropolitan areas.

In considering home rule proposals, the human realities of the District must be taken into consideration. The basic reality is that the bulk of the city's middle class—the people who make possible good government in American communities—have moved out of the District into Virginia and Maryland. In exchange, the city has received a great influx of migrants who, to use the polite term of modern sociologists, are "socially deprived." In plainer terms, Washington is inundated with poorly educated people who are ill-prepared for electing responsible city officials. Because of this population, the crime problem is appalling as has been reported by the Washington Star and other newspapers.

Even if home rule were desirable, now is not the time for it. The migrants need to gain education and understanding of a citizen's responsibilities. To force through home rule would be to fasten demagogic "bossism" on the National Capital. It would be a national and international disgrace that could not be hidden.

For these reasons, Congressman McMillan's opposition to home rule is a sound and reasoned position that should be respected from Maine to Hawaii.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper letter of August 26, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District Texas, August 26, 1961)

SUICIDE, NOT DEFEAT—PRIMER OF SELF-DESTRUCTION

If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction—LENIN.

Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you. Your grandchildren will live under communism.—KHRUSHCHEV.

Let's look at some specific ingredients of a primer of self-destruction. Simultaneously, we can trace the United States' embrace of socialism-communism (retreat from freedom and free enterprise) in each, inasmuch as we have partially or completely accepted the Socialist-Communist doctrine and are moving further in that direction. We say we believe in freedom, but we are taking contrary action, which will undoubtedly lead us into the slavery of a Socialist-Communist state.

1. Fiscal irresponsibility (spending ourselves into bankruptcy). The Socialist-Communist theory of Government manipulation of money, artificial interest rates, deficit spending, back-door financing of foreign aid and other programs, including income tax, almost as though modeled on Communist principles. Example of irresponsibility will show up in probable conference report on foreign aid bill which, if adopted will mean the total of "back-door spending" put through in this session of Congress alone will have totaled more than \$28 billion. This means, in effect, that Congress will have voted away control over one-third of the entire Federal budget. Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 16): "Ever since this session began, we have been spending in the red at the rate of \$1 million every hour, day and night." Antidote for this type of suicide: Fiscal responsibility: a balanced budget, flexible interest rates, tax reform.

2. Private business forced out by Government competition. Through subsidizing businesses and outright control by the Federal Government we force private business to compete with tax-free federalized institutions. The solution: Get the Government out of business—eliminate subsidies. Free enterprise does not need Government incentives and aid.

3. The steady and relentless increase of public power projects including nuclear power. A basic Socialist-Communist concept for complete control of the people by state-owned and operated sources of power. In support of freedom we should encourage full and rapid development of private power.

4. Labor monopoly (encouraged by Government) has developed dictatorial labor leaders who make unrealistic demands which continually push up the wage-price spiral and inhibit the operation of a free market and thus contribute to a Socialist-Communist doctrine. To strengthen our economy and to keep American labor free, labor or-

ganizations must be subject to antitrust laws.

5. The gradual imposition of State-owned and controlled housing for all the people through federally sponsored and dictated slum clearance and housing programs. Individual rights and private home ownership can be guaranteed only by keeping the responsibility for slum clearance at the local level and the development of housing through private enterprise and individual initiative.

6. A first step in any Socialist-Communist takeover, rob the farmers of freedom to produce. We are accomplishing it through ever-increasing subsidies which create artificial surpluses making more and more Federal control of what the farmer plants and what he sells necessary. To free the farmer we should eliminate subsidies, cut back surpluses and allow agriculture to operate in a free market.

7. Government sponsored and supported industry and Federal distribution of food in an effort to eliminate depressed areas simply worsens the situation, incites the need for further Federal controls, insures the dependency of the people on the Government and the end result is a Socialist-Communist state. Private enterprise is the only solution to the problem of unemployment. Sensible tax laws which make risk capital available, freeing industry and business from bureaucratic control will give the free-enterprise system full opportunity to function. It is under this system we developed the highest living standard in the world for the most people.

8. The Socialist-Communist planners have always started their campaign for a takeover by seizing the minds of the youth. Federal aid to education (and youth conservation corps) must invariably be followed by Federal control and bureaucratic dictation of what is taught, and by whom. A free society can be guaranteed only so long as our schools remain free. This can be maintained only so long as the control of education remains in the hands of the people at the local level who have the most direct interest in the education of their children.

9. A basic Socialist-Communist precept is state directed and financed medical care. Bills now before Congress would open the door for the complete socialization of medicine and ruin the high standard of medical care (the best in the world) now enjoyed by the American people. Only a determined effort to keep the Government from getting its foot in the door by trying medical care for the aged to social security and other proposals being offered, will keep the freedom of our medical men to give our people the best possible medical care.

10. Federal attempts to provide cradle-to-grave security by so-called Government insurance rather than actuarially sound pensions and annuities weakens our future financial strength as well as the character and moral fiber of the people making them ripe victims for Socialist-Communist planners. The answer for free men is voluntary pension plans which are actuarially sound and do not depend upon the support of future generations or political handouts.

11. Our defense against the military aspirations of the Communists has been weakened by a self-imposed nuclear test ban. Self-interest demands that we resume nuclear testing immediately in order to maintain our lead in nuclear weapons over the Soviet Union which refuses to negotiate in honesty and has a history of never honoring treaties or agreements.

12. Giving impetus to the program to spend us into bankruptcy is a foreign aid program which gives away the money of American taxpayers to Communist countries, so-called neutrals and others who have shown a preference for the policies of the Soviet Union and socialism and an enmity of the United States. The least we

can do to keep from contributing to our own destruction is to deny any foreign aid to any country which is devoted to our destruction, Russia, Poland, and other Communist satellites; Socialists and neutrals (like India) which line up with the Communists on every issue; and others who play the United States off against Russia in their own self-interest (Brazil). The ridiculous extent to which we go is stated by Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22) "Dr. Cheddi Jagan and his Communist-dominated People's Progressive Party have apparently won a cloudy victory at the polls in British Guiana. Jagan was receiving all-out support of Radio Moscow, Radio Peiping, and the Castro radio. But British Broadcasting Corp. and the Voice of America did absolutely nothing to help the opposition and nothing to expose the people of British Guiana the Communist nature of the Jagan movement. Worse than this, in the weeks preceding the election we gave our assent to a \$2 million loan by the World Bank to the previous Jagan regime, and Jagan was able to use this loan to bolster his political reputation. I consider this nothing short of a scandal I believe Congress is entitled to know how it came about that Jagan got this loan at so critical a juncture." As some see it, South America takeover by communism has begun with our aid.

3. An indecisive and weak foreign policy causes us loss of prestige in the world, weakens the support of our allies, and ripens us for a Communist takeover. There can be no substitute for a strong foreign policy in which we reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine; take immediate steps to free Cuba from the Communists, which will take the pressure off the Berlin situation by showing Khrushchev we are able to take decisive action; protect American citizens and property anywhere in the world where they are threatened; support any free people which shows its determination to resist Communist aggression and subversion.

The choice now rests with the American people. Are we to remain free or continue to sow the seeds of our own destruction? Only understanding and a strong protest from the people to every Member of Congress will reverse the trend and save our free way of life.

THE COMMUNIST PLAN FOR OUR DEFEAT

"War to hit between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeois will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists" (quote from talk given by Dimitri Z. Manuisky at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1930).

The Equal Rights for Women Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution

by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 62

To the members of the senate and house of representatives:

We, the undersigned, committee of conference on the part of the senate and house of representatives for the purpose of considering House Resolution 62, resolving (the senate concurring) that the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment, respectfully submit the following bill as our report.

WILLIAM J. LANE,

PETER J. CAMIEL,

CLARENCE D. BELL,

Committee on the Part of the Senate.

MARION L. MUNLEY,

KATHRYN GRAHAM PASHLEY,

ELISABETH S. WYND,

Committee on the Part of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 24, 1961.

Whereas there has been introduced in the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961, the equal rights for women amendment which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and

Whereas this amendment reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex": Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

We certify that this bill has passed the house of representatives and the senate.

JOSEPH OMINSKY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

HIRAM G. ANDREWS,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

ANTHONY DiSILVESTRO,

President pro tempore, Senate.

Approved the 21st day of August, A.D. 1961.

Governor.

Transfiguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Edward Paca, has sent to me an original poem with a prayerful message. Mr. Paca was largely instrumental in obtaining for the last resting place of veterans, the Fort Logan National Cemetery located in my district. At the present time there is pending before committee a private bill to permit Mr. Paca to be buried next to his son in that cemetery. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Paca's message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRANSFIGURATION

(By Tilghman Paca)

I make my herculean thrust
To say to God: "You surely must
Make in this abhorred dilemma
Mighty men from wind-blown dust.

"Too long have arrant human trash
Belabored life by goad and lash:
In their avaricious fever
Left a deep unhealing gash.

"The virile manhood in their breast
Had never stood to take its test.
Only You can call attention,
Then their souls will do the rest."

Out of legends grim and gory
Come that soul-bestirring story:
Men, in sunburst of their soul-light,
Glow in God's shining glory.

Swift as the twinkle of an eye,
Decisions made to do or die,
That the purity of honor
They will hold forever high.

Resolutions of General Federation of Women's Club Convention, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years our free way of life—functioning upon the general principles of the Constitution—has been greatly strengthened by voluntary assistance of citizens for serving individual and national interests.

Today, I refer to one such outstanding group, the General Federation of Women's Clubs. As a "voice" for about 11 million members in 15,500 clubs in the United States, and 50 nations around the world, the Federation today is making a useful, constructive, creative contribution to public thinking on the formation of national policy.

Today, I was privileged to receive a copy of the resolution as adopted at the 1961 convention. Reflecting the thoughtful views of the Federation on major national and international interests, I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS CONVENTION, 1961

I. UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs, having international headquarters in Washington, D.C., United States of America, for 11 million members in 15,500 clubs in the United States of America and 50 other nations in the world, declares its support of the United Nations in accordance with a resolution adopted in 1947 and reaffirmed in 1952; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant of the ever-increasing influence of the United Nations as the only true world forum and where every member nation is pledged to seek peace with freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Board of Directors Meeting, assembled in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on September 29, 1960, commends the continuing achievements of the United Nations and salutes it as the greatest organized hope for all mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs pledges its support of and confidence in the United States of America delegation at the United Nations and in the present Secretary General.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

II. GASOLINE TAX

Whereas the average combined State-Federal tax on gasoline now amounts to a sales tax of approximately 50 percent, the highest rate on an everyday item in the entire economy; and

Whereas when Congress increased the Federal gasoline tax in 1959 it was understood that this would be a temporary measure and that the added 1 cent of tax would expire on June 30, 1961, to be replaced by specified portions of the Federal highway user taxes not now being applied to the national highway program; and

Whereas the national highway program, the costliest public work undertaking in human history, is being financed entirely by the Federal level by taxes on highway users, and nearly 80 percent of the program's support now comes from the Federal tax on gasoline; and

Whereas Federal taxes imposed on gasoline and on motor vehicle ownership and use now cost approximately \$4.3 billion a year, but only about \$2.6 billion of this revenue is being applied to the support of the Federal share of the national highway program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs hereby calls upon the entire delegation of Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to work actively for the expiration of the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax on the promised date, for the use of the specified portion of the automobile and parts and accessories taxes for the highway program, as also promised, and for the rejection of any proposal for a further increase in the Federal tax on gasoline; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Senators and to all Members of the House of Representatives.

Submitted by Mrs. Guy Nelson, chairman consumer and finance division.

Approved by the resolution committee.

III. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Amend water pollution control resolution passed in convention, 1900, reaffirmed 1955:

Whereas our country's waters are vital to its very existence; to its economic and social progress; to its national safety; and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic, agricultural, fishing, wildlife, recreational uses, and industrial productive capacity are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers, and lakes; and

Whereas the responsibility for water pollution control is primarily State and local, a majority of the Nation's rivers are interstate streams or tributaries thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that local, State, and Federal agencies cooperate to accomplish adequate pollution abatement; that pollution control be developed as an integral part of comprehensive river-basin programs; that the Pollution Control Act of Congress, June 30, 1948, as amended, be extended and implemented; and that stronger regulatory laws be enacted to improve water pollution control with the broadest possible benefits to the public.

Amend by deleting paragraphs 3 and 4 and by adding 6 new paragraphs.

Proposed amended resolution

Whereas our country's waters are vital to its very existence; to its economic and social progress; to its national safety; and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic, agricultural, fishing, wildlife, recreational uses, and industrial productive capacity are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes; and

Whereas the reports of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources indicate that our Nation is confronted with very serious water supply problems directly related to rapid population and industrial growth and change, making it necessary to use the same water over and over; and

Whereas waste treatment plants in use have not fully eliminated all objectionable pollutants from public water; and

Whereas prevention and control of pollution is necessary to serve the widest possible range of human needs; and

Whereas the responsibility for water pollution control is primarily State and local; therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges its member clubs to promote a program of education emphasizing the urgency of prevention and control of water pollutants; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that (1) private industry, local, State, and Federal agencies encourage research and that they cooperate to accomplish adequate water supply and pollution abatement; that (2) pollution control be developed as an integral part of comprehensive river-basin programs; and that (3) stronger regulatory laws be enacted to improve water pollution control.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Amend technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas resolution passed at convention, 1950:

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has consistently manifested its concern in the material welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its support of the principle of joint responsibility among free nations for economic stability and mutual security; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorses the principles of the program which provides basic technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, encourages private investment of capital needed for this economic development; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress to provide adequate appropriation for the technical assistance program.

Amend by inserting after the word "development" in paragraph 3 the words "and which uses carefully screened, qualified young people and adults in the program":

Proposed amended resolution

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has consistently manifested its concern in the material welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its support of the principle of joint responsibility among free nations for economic stability and mutual security; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of

Women's Clubs endorses the principles of the program which provides basic technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, encourages private investment of capital needed for this economic development and which uses carefully screened, qualified young people and adults in the program; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress to provide adequate appropriation for the technical assistance program.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

V. EFFICIENCY IN ELECTION PROCEDURES

Whereas, the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant that, to effect the greatest efficiency in operation, it is necessary from time to time to review methods and procedures; and

Whereas, modern transportation and communication facilities enable the public to become better informed on candidates and issues and eliminate the necessity for lengthy campaigns; and

Whereas the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States merits consideration and study; and

Whereas many responsible citizens in changing their place of residence have been deprived of their right of franchise in national elections due to the variation in State residency laws: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that a bipartisan committee be appointed by the Congress of the United States to study and make recommendations for modern, efficient, and equitable campaigns and election procedures.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

RESOLUTIONS

I. SUPPORT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Whereas promotion of Western Hemisphere solidarity long has been an established policy of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Western Hemisphere security is safeguarded by the structure of the Organization of American States,

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its faith in and support of the Organization of American States and urges it to exert firm and active leadership in the threatened areas of the Western Hemisphere, thereby insuring security and preventing further repressive measures.

Submitted by the executive committee.

II. SUPPORT OF NATO

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has supported NATO from the inception of its organization,

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its faith in and support of this Organization, and urges strong leadership within the member nations to safeguard the security of threatened areas.

Submitted by the executive committee.

RESOLUTION

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Whereas the Communist penetration and aggression is a threat to the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas the relentless pressure of communism jeopardizes western hemispheric solidarity: Therefore

Resolved, That the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in the 50 States, the District of Columbia and 53 other countries strongly support the U.S. Government in its efforts to prevent the persistent pressures by the Communists to exploit and take over the free world.

Submitted by the internal affairs department.

I'll Pledge My Fortune**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Hoppe, a columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, has recently prepared two columns which I wish to include as an extension of my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The first, entitled "I'll Pledge My Fortune" appeared in the August 23, 1961, issue of the Chronicle; and the second, entitled "Teddy's Most Equal of All" appeared in the August 25, 1961, issue of the same newspaper:

I'LL PLEDGE MY FORTUNE

(By Art Hoppe)

Phew. I'm glad we've solved the Berlin crisis. I mean the crisis in which our West German allies got sore at us because they thought we were too chicken to risk a nuclear war in their behalf.

They sent Mr. Kennedy an umbrella to remind him of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. And their officials and newspapers were saying some pretty mean things about how gutless we were, wanting to negotiate with the Russians and all.

Of course we still occupy West Germany on account of we licked and disbanded forever the German Army, which was one of the best in Europe. But it's very important we appease them now. On account of the German Army is one of the best in Europe.

So Mr. Kennedy swiftly dispatches reinforcements to Berlin to show our German allies we aren't gutless. What he dispatches is 1,500 troops and Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON. I don't think the troops alone would have appeased the Germans. Mainly because Berlin's surrounded by 300,000 Russian soldiers armed to the teeth. Of course, we could have pointed out that these odds were no worse than we faced when we invade Cuba. But somehow, I don't think we would have.

No, sir, it was Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON who saved the day. Mr. JOHNSON told the Germans to remember the Alamo and implied we'd never negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Russians. The Germans were so happy they threw flowers at him. He handed out ballpoint pens. And everybody cried.

I thought Mr. JOHNSON brought it off awfully well. He's getting to be a very experienced nonretreating allies appeaser.

Every time we get a crisis among our allies, which is very often lately, Mr. Kennedy dispatches Mr. JOHNSON. Like in Asia, Mr. JOHNSON goes all over Asia, says he'll never retreat, climbs on a water buffalo, gets clobbered with flowers, hands out ballpoint pens and everybody cries. It's a great thing for the ballpoint pen industry. I just hope Mr. JOHNSON isn't getting overextended.

But Berlin was his finest hour. He said: "You shall prevail." He said he would never retreat an inch. And then he flew back to Washington.

But what I liked best, even though it had a familiar ring, was when he pledged to defend the Germans, who are now our friends, with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." I thought that was awfully nice of him and Lady Bird. They've got a lot to lose. I mean I don't have a fortune. And I don't guess my honor's very sacred. So he's not risking much of mine. Just my life.

TEDDY'S MOST EQUAL OF ALL

Some kind souls sent me a clipping out of U.S. News & World Report on Mr. Teddy Kennedy's recent good will tour of South America. It's where he appears before this band of ragged Brazilian peasants and says: "President Kennedy is personally concerned with your welfare and as proof has sent me, his own brother, to talk to you as an equal."

That's all U.S. News & World Report reports and it frustrates me. I figure one of the gravest problems we've got is how the rich, like the United States and the Kennedys, can convince the poor, like Brazil and me, that they really worry about us personally. As equals. So how did Mr. Teddy Kennedy follow up that whiz-bang opener? I've had to go and make it up:

"Yes sir, Muchachos, not only am I your equal, but my brother, Jack, is your equal, too. Honest to Dios, I can't tell you how concerned Jack is with your welfare. Personally. On account of you are such a crummy, illiterate lot."

"Yes sir, Compadres, I remember him saying so very well. We are sitting in the sun outside our little casa in Hyannisport. Which is a tiny farming village where the crops haven't been so good lately. And Jack kind of scratches himself and says:

"Teddy," he says, "I am very concerned, personally, with the welfare of my friends, those crummy, illiterate peasants of the Xylotri Tribe down in Northeastern Brazil. Each and every one of them. Jose, Rosita, Pablo and What's-his-name."

"So I says, 'Jack,' I says, trying to cheer him up, 'you shouldn't worry so. You've worked 6 days making this a better world and on the seventh you ought to rest. After all, I says, "you just scored a tremendous diplomatic victory at Punte del Este in Uruguay."

"Which one's that?" says Jack. "Why," I says, "that's where you called all those Latin Americans together, told them we were equals, and, after forceful arguing and skillful compromises, got them to accept \$20 billion from us." "That's right," says Jack. "But it's not enough. I want to prove to my crummy, illiterate Xylotri friends that I think of them as equals. And there's nobody more equal than you, Teddy. So I am sending you, my own begotten brother, to descend among them and . . ."

The only other thing that worries me is that U.S. News & World Report didn't say whether Mr. Teddy Kennedy got back from Brazil all right. I hope so. I mean anyone wandering around making speeches like that is liable to get crucified.

Troops' Best Weapon? Courage**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following portion of a column written by Mr. Jack Anderson, Mr. Drew Pearson's associate, that appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 27, 1961.

The indicated material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1961]

TROOPS' BEST WEAPON? COURAGE

(By Jack Anderson)

(Drew Pearson is in Russia. His associate, Jack Anderson, is covering the Washington scene.)

The heroic spectacle of 1,500 American troops rolling into Berlin last Sunday was slightly marred by the antiquity of their equipment.

Those who looked closely may have noticed that this bold battle group, pride of the U.S. Army, was scarcely better equipped than the GI's who swarmed into Berlin 16 years earlier.

These 1961 soldiers carried 1941 rifles, some M-1's, some Browning automatics. Slapping against their sides were .45 pistols, which were first used in 1899 during the Philippine Insurrection.

Their machineguns and hand grenades were of World War II vintage, their mortars and howitzers only slightly improved over the World War II models.

The tall Texan in command, Col. Glover Johns, Jr., bravely ordered his men to look and act like the damn best soldiers in the U.S. Army.

Their performance might have been more convincing, however, if they hadn't been obliged to appear in the battle dress of a past war. Their helmets, canteens, web belts, and knapsacks were hand-me-downs from World War II. The field uniforms, though newer, had the same old look.

In contrast, the Soviet troops surrounding Berlin are completely armed and outfitted for the next, rather than the last war. Their weapons include deadly nuclear-tipped tactical rockets.

America Today Through Europe's Eyes**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, despite all the roar and thunder during the political campaign last fall, on how strong and firm we should be in dealing with the Communists, thus far all the American people have witnessed has been talk by President Kennedy.

The following article by Constantine Brown, in the Washington Evening Star of August 24, relates some impressions of Europeans on what we are doing vis-a-vis the Communists:

WHERE U.S. POLICIES STIR DOUBT—SWISS OBSERVER SEES AMERICAN ACTIONS WEAKENING OUR HOLD ON FRIENDS

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Headlines of the daily papers reflect nothing but trouble throughout the world, with vastly important crises relegated to inside pages to make way for the newest crises or the latest developments on a current one.

This flood of adverse news has made me ponder more on the prophecies of my Swiss friend whose large industries in foreign lands have made him an earnest and thoughtful student of world developments and who predicted the United States would be plagued with numerous internal strains. The following is a continuation report on his views.

"In Europe," he told me, "the main targets of the Communists are de Gaulle and Adenauer. It is obvious that the Soviets are trying to pull in the net around de Gaulle. The pattern which besets France is similar to that in many other free countries. The French President's sound idea of an Algerian-French community—at one time welcomed by the FLN—has now been rejected by the rebels. Then there was the abortive military

coup last spring which is being used by the Communists who are, by indirect methods, inciting the ultras in France.

"Tunisia's Bourguiba played a cunning hand. He was a friend of France and de Gaulle, but under the impact of the unseen forces in his own government, his hand was forced and he committed an act of aggression against his former dear friend.

"Now, possibly against his better judgment, Bourguiba is turning toward Russia and the Arab League.

"And because U.S. Presidents have been willing to meet with Khrushchev anywhere, any time—even when one of them was left at the post in Paris and then insulted by being disinvited to Moscow—the statesmen of Italy fear that their country can no longer stand firm against the Soviets.

"How long do you think Franco and Salazar, who with all their faults keep their countries on an even keel, can last when the U.S. policy is to side with the Kremlin and its anticolonialism campaign?

"You may ask what about Germany; it has no internal problems, and the leader, Adenauer, is strong. But why should the Kremlin worry about Germany? If all their allies are weakened by serious troubles, can West Germany survive for long?

"Let us look toward the Middle East once more. Turkey is at the crossroads; the military junta is divided; some believe in standing by the commitments to NATO; others prefer neutralism and friendship with Russia.

"Look at Pakistan, one of your staunchest allies. It now has recognized the Soviet-supported Algerian rebel government. President Ayub Khan is slowly turning toward the Moscow-Peking combine.

"In the Far East the strong man of Korea fell before the student riots which had the support of your Government. Don't say it isn't so. Was not the student leader invited to lunch at the American Embassy with President Eisenhower when he visited that country? Although the anti-Communist military has taken over since June, I doubt that in the present turmoil Korea can long survive.

"And Japan, the strongest of all Asian countries, has been licking its wounds from the student riots of 1959 and after, casting a doubtful eye to Washington, is quietly and expediently working toward economic agreements with Communist China.

"Also in the Far East we have the perennial controversial figure of Chiang Kai-shek. It is true that President Kennedy used strong words to reassure the free world that you will do your utmost to prevent Communist China from being admitted to the United Nations. But will your strongly liberal-minded U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson be able to muster sufficient votes to prevent Red China's case from reaching the U.N. agenda?"

The vastly interesting comments of my friend will be concluded in the next column.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. B. Armstrong of Travis County, Tex., is one of the most admired and revered men I have ever known. He was born and reared on a farm and ranch more than 80 years ago and has been engaged in farming and ranching ever since.

He is a charter member of the board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Electric Cooperative, Inc., the headquarters of which are at Giddings, Lee County, Tex. On August 18, 1961, he delivered an address to the area development panel of the Texas Electric Cooperatives at its annual meeting.

Because I know all of us who are interested in the agricultural sections of our districts and particularly in the program of rural electrification will be interested in his remarks, I ask that his speech be made a part of my remarks:

REMARKS BY MR. H. B. ARMSTRONG, AREA DEVELOPMENT PANEL, TEXAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ANNUAL MEETING, SAN ANTONIO, AUGUST 18, 1961

In looking over this crowd of rural electrification folks I feel that I can speak to the youngest and the eldest. I was born and reared on a farm and ranch in Bell County more than 80 years ago. I have made my living on a farm and ranch ever since.

I have been secretary-treasurer of the Lower Colorado River Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Giddings, Tex., for 23 years and I am a charter member of the board of directors. As one of the charter members I have had an interest and a part in developing our cooperative as it is today. We have experienced as a board of directors many problems. We have faced each problem individually and learned that there is only one way that you can handle a problem—that is with a solution.

In the early days it was a matter of explaining to prospective members the advantage of electric lights over the kerosene lamp. This was a hard and tedious job. The next step was to select a captain to steer the ship in the future and keep it on its course. He is a professional and to him we leave the mechanics of getting done the jobs we directors deem necessary for our cooperative.

Now, I am not here alone. Every member of our board is here—and that is what we have to do. We must attend meetings if we are to keep up to date with new developments. Next year, use your influence to see that your entire board is here.

At LCREC, we feel that the boardroom is the place to discuss policies of concern to our members. We take our members needs very seriously. They had a need for convenient financing so we developed the pay-easy plan. They had a need for a better understanding of how to use electricity, so we developed a power-use department.

Our manager is Martin Hyltin. He has been successful in selling our board on the need for each director to thoroughly appreciate the use of electricity by actually using it themselves. As far as I can ascertain we do not have a single director who uses gas or any other fuel in their own homes—everyone of our directors is all electric. Our rural schools had a need for thoroughly trained VO-AG teachers so we developed a course in electricity to be conducted in association with the Texas Education Agency.

All development arises out of need. As members of the board, we are concerned about the many changes taking place in our area. As all of you know, the average age of farmers or ranchers today is much higher than it was 25 years ago. This means young families who could not make a go of farming and ranching have left, taking our young folks with them. Our schools are consolidating, with the result that rural schools are closing and our cooperative has many idle serves where families used to live. The total value of these idle services represent a tremendous investment.

The congregations in most rural churches get smaller nearly every Sunday. These are the types of churches most of you have devoted a lifetime to building. What will these efforts have been for if there are not enough people left in the area to belong.

Our young families aren't staying—six out of seven high school graduates leave because there is no opportunity for them to remain and work at home. The parents can no longer look forward to their children and grandchildren living in the close-by area. What will be the value of the ranches and farms which have been accumulated if few can make a living in the area—if there are less and less buyers?

What will be the value of the equity of our cooperative lines and equipment if less and less rural folks live in the area to use the service we provide? Can we afford to ignore this economic need of our members? We are fighting to protect our rights in fringe areas. Should we not also, fight just as hard to protect our member's economic position.

We have all been elected by the membership to represent their best interests. It is for each of you to decide if you are actually concerning yourselves about what you and your board can and should do in your members' interests. We have this responsibility to them. The need for improvement is obvious in all rural areas.

There are opportunities for development all around us, but it takes someone to start community action. Take, for example, the recreational and resort developing of a lake. Someone has to cut a road down to the lake front, and run an electric line into the area. If you make it easy for other people they will do the developing. Once they can get to the lake front, they will buy and build.

Many rural churches are hanging on with part-time preachers while others are going under. Help them build a consolidated rural church and they will have the strength to grow. These people are some of the best workers obtainable anywhere. Draw them into your development programs. Make them partners in your overall program. If yours is to be an areawide campaign, organize community councils where neighbors can work together as a part of the county or areawide endeavor.

Each of you are extremely influential in your areas. You have been elected as a director because of your prominence and because your ability is highly respected at home. You must put this influence to work. Your members will listen to you and will follow the leadership you provide.

Start with five or six of your acquaintances. Point out the problems facing rural areas. Census figures will provide you with a wealth of material. Enlist the aid of your county agent, civic clubs, youth leaders, and anyone, and everyone. Give your manager and staff the support and policies they will need to coordinate the efforts of these communities in the total overall program.

We have been working 25 years to get these electric facilities on a firm footing. To pioneer the lines in virgin territory. Now is the time to go to work insuring the future soundness of our co-ops. Our competition serves the dynamic growth areas of Texas. They are prospering because the areas they serve are thriving, busy places. If we are to merely keep pace we must provide the same area development assistance which they have been providing for years.

Area development is a director's responsibility to the membership and a challenge to the board.

What I have said here today—reminds me of what the bantam rooster said to the bantam hen when he came upon the ostrich egg out on the desert. He said to her, "I don't expect you to do this, but it goes to show what can be done if you try a little harder."

**Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns
Urges More Efficient Procedures With
Respect to Federal-Local Programs**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Michael P. Curran, assistant executive director of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns, Boston, Mass., and a statement outlining the league's objectives:

MASSACHUSETTS LEAGUE

OF CITIES AND TOWNS,

Boston, Mass., August 24, 1961.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: At the first annual convention of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns held on May 27, 1961, at Worcester, a policy statement outlining league objectives was adopted by the delegates. A copy of section 5 of that policy statement is enclosed for your information.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL P. CURRAN,

Assistant Executive Director.

SECTION 5. FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

A. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The Federal Government has adopted a number of aid programs, the intent and purpose of which are to make available Federal funds for the programing and construction of a wide range of local facilities. Such programs include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Federal Planning Advances, HHFA, section 702 Public Law 560; (b) Federal Assistance for School Construction, Public Law 815; (c) Federal Civil Defense Contributions program Civil Defense Act of 1950; (d) Urban Planning Assistance, HHFA, section 701, Public Law 560; (e) Airports, Federal Airport Act; (f) Small watershed projects, Public Law 566, as amended; (g) Public Facilities Loans programs, Public Law 345; (h) Urban Renewal, Housing Acts of 1949, 1954, 1957, and 1959; (i) Sewerage treatment aid, Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956; (j) Rural library service, Library Services Act; (k) Hospital construction, Hill-Burton Act, 1946; (l) Federal highway program, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959; (m) Land for recreation and public purposes, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, as amended by the acts of 1954 and 1959; (n) National Guard Armory construction, National Defense Facilities Act of 1950; (o) Beach erosion control, River and Harbors Act of 1932, together with other legislation pertinent thereto.

In enacting these aid program, the Federal Government geared the allocation of such funds to certain considerations and conditions, few of which seem to be consistent with one another. While some of the programs are administered by the same agency, there are many agencies involved in these aid programs, with national and regional offices located according to their own operating needs.

B. THE MASSACHUSETTS SITUATION

New England has long been considered as a natural unit because of both its geography and its economy. The six States which comprise the region have worked together continuously through the years in the pursuance

of a large number of common interests both public and private. The New England Council, New England Board of Higher Education, New England Building Officials Conference, New England Colleges Fund, and many other groups too numerous to mention are indicative of the degree of cooperation which presently exists in the region. Just as the region has long been considered a natural one, so has Boston been considered as its natural center, because of its central location and the availability of water, rail, air, and highway access to it from anywhere in the region.

Currently, New England municipalities which wish to take advantage of any of the various Federal aid programs find it necessary for their officials to contact representatives of a great many Federal agencies. A municipal official seeking information and aid under any of these programs may find it necessary to travel extensively to a number of Government centers, including the District of Columbia, and to talk with many different Federal officials. In doing so, he will find that the regulations governing the submission and approval of project applications vary considerably with the agencies involved.

C. MASSACHUSETTS MUNICIPAL POLICY

Whereas the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns is desirous of more efficient procedures with respect to Federal-local programs,

Therefore every effort should be made to simplify the regulations and administrative procedures required under air programs. To this end, the league urges the Federal Government to adopt a system of standard operating procedures (insofar as it is possible to do so) which may be common to all Federal agencies in carrying out aid programs of benefit to local communities, such simplification of administrative procedures accruing to the advantage of both Federal and local governments, and

Further that, it is recommended that an agency of the Federal Government be established in New England, and preferably in the city of Boston, capable of directing from a single headquarters these aid programs. Such central office would be of great benefit in the processing of applications and progress reports for the entire region, and

Finally that it is strongly urged that the Members of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States support legislation creating a Department of Urban Affairs, with a Cabinet level administrator in the executive branch of the Government.

**Columbia Camp of United Spanish
War Veterans**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in September the surviving veterans of the war with Spain will meet at Little Rock in Arkansas for the National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans. Columbia Camp in Chicago will be represented as always it has been since the commencement of the organization many, many years ago.

At one time Columbia Camp had a membership of many hundreds, including Col. James Hamilton Lewis, then U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois

and one of the most brilliant, eloquent, and colorful statesman in the history of the other body.

I now look over the role of the past commanders of Columbia Camp. Of the 49 who served as camp commanders, only 9 are left. The present commander, Charles Ziesenhenné, and Sam Black, the camp adjutant, have recently sent a letter to the members of the camp. I quote from this letter:

Do you know that the average age of the members of Columbia Camp is 83 years and 10 months? Our oldest member is Charles Graham, who was born February 7, 1868. Our youngest member is BARRATT O'HARA who was born April 28, 1882. These figures were taken from the descriptive book which you signed when you became a member.

It is a rare distinction to be numbered among the youngsters in Columbia Camp and among the oldsters in the Congress.

Day Wins Employee Raves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, August 23, 1961, concerning our Postmaster General, J. Edward Day.

We Californians were very pleased when the President came to our State to select one of his Cabinet members. We are justifiably proud of the record which Postmaster General Day has made during his short term in that responsible office.

Those of us who have known Ed for some time, know of his spectacular business success and of the substantial contribution he made to good government in California as a member of the Governor's metropolitan areas commission. We expected no less from him than the record which is related by Mary McCrory:

AFTER 6 MONTHS—DAY WINS EMPLOYEE
RAVES

(By Mary McGory)

J. Edward Day, the crisp and sunny Postmaster General of the United States, pursues a course on the New Frontier that is as solitary and simple as that of a rural letter carrier.

Unlike those who must ponder the effect of a decision of a touchy new African republic or sulky soybean growers, he has but a single concern. The improvement of the mail service.

He sees the President about twice a month. The President mentioned the importance of the postal rate increase, now pending before Congress, in his Berlin crisis speech; but the mechanics of seeing that the postmen make their appointed rounds, he leaves to Mr. Day, a former life insurance executive.

Mr. Day is the only Cabinet officer who is rereading "Wuthering Heights" these days and writing a novel of his own. He is the only one who is not addicted to the 14-hour working day and who claims to lead a normal family life. He finds he can do his

work in the hours between 8:45 in the morning and 6 at night.

"I used to work in a law firm where the caste-symbol was the bulging briefcase carried home at night. I used to think if they were carrying a live mouse in it, it would be dead by morning. I never carried a briefcase," he remarked jovially.

If he differs from his fellows in the Cabinet, Mr. Day also differs from his predecessors, mainly portly chaps who also were chairmen of their national committees. Mr. Day, lean of countenance and figure, has no party responsibilities at all. He has failed to get this message across.

"A lot of my time is wasted by a lot of people, who ought to know better, asking me to get them jobs as Federal marshals or regional attorneys for the Labor Department. They just don't believe I can't do it."

QUARTERS ARE AMPLE

Mr. Day's office is the largest of any Cabinet officer's. It is paneled in wood and of a grandeur to satisfy General de Gaulle. He works about half-a-mile from the door at a clear desk with a clear mind.

Across from his quarters is another baronial hall, where one of his most famous predecessors, James A. Farley, used to make his way among the leather armchairs, patting the shoulders of politicians and inquiring for their Aunt Mames.

Mr. Day hasn't figured out a use for the room, while acknowledging its usefulness to inspire awe in the petitioner.

His only constituents besides the letter-writers of the Nation, who are so far unorganized, are the 580,000 employees of the Post Office Department, most of whom are clustered in 15 Federal postal unions.

After 6 months of his "open door" policy, he is drawing rave notices. William Doherty, the head of the Letter Carriers Union, said recently in a Dayton speech: "For the first time in many, many years, we are able to work with the Department as partners instead of having to cool our heels in unfriendly anterooms waiting for a few crumbs of comfort to fall from the tables of the mighty."

TREND REVERSER

Mr. Doherty is the author of a book called "Mailman, U.S.A." which devotes several searing chapters of the previous Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, who he suggests enjoyed as much love and affection from the postal workers as Ezra Taft Benson got from the farmers.

Mr. Day has concentrated in his first 6 months on building up "friendliness, warmth and enthusiasm" in the Department and in "reversing certain trends" started by the publicity-conscious Mr. Summerfield.

"There was too much ballyhoo about post-office equipment and automation and too many announcements about sending mail by rocket and coaxial cables."

Mr. Day also insisted on putting in his own men as the 15 regional directors of the postal system. He confers with them by network conference telephone every Wednesday afternoon. He recently completed a 40,000-mile tour of 40 major post offices, where he put to the employees such pertinent questions as whether they liked to pace a mail-sorting machine or preferred to have it pace them. He tried to discourage everybody from calling him "General."

Mr. Day has made considerable impression on Capitol Hill as a witness, a role well suited to one with his appetite for comparative statistics. But he has fared less well as an advocate. His postal-rate increase bill is about as popular as the 5-year term foreign aid program and Chairman JOHNSTON of South Carolina of the Senate Post Office Committee has set his face against it.

"I have differences with Mr. JOHNSTON, but no antagonisms," said Mr. Day.

Mr. Day's introduction of the merit system, whereby men from within the ranks are promoted to supervisory posts on recommendation of a selection board has rendered him something less than a hero with patronage-hungry Congressmen. He is quite stoical about their complaints. He warned everyone at the beginning that he would run the post office.

HAS ANSWER FOR HECKLERS

He does not appreciate hecklers who point out the superior glories of the European mail system, which still has two deliveries a day.

"The New York City Post Office handles more mail in a day than the entire British Postal System," he says firmly. "And the New York City Post Office hasn't had a new building in 30 years."

Who Wants Federal Aid to Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, assuming that, before we adjourn we will get proposed legislation on Federal aid to education, the following editorial from the Sturgis Journal, published daily at Sturgis, St. Joseph County, Mich., written by Marla Haines will be helpful:

WHO WANTS FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION?

The strategy of the advocates of Federal aid to education has now become apparent. The powerful school lobby and the welfare staters in Congress, reconciled to the fact that Federal aid for schools, as originally proposed, is a dead issue at this session, have come up with an ingenious scheme to divide and conquer. The plan now is to split the Federal aid proposal into two packages and attempt to force approval of one or both in the confusion of the closing weeks of the current Congress. It will take a determined effort on the part of an aroused public to foil this outrageous attempt to thwart the will of the people and make a political racket of public education.

Back of this latest move to foist unwanted and unneeded Federal aid on our public educational system is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Negro Congressman from New York, who by some incongruous quirk of politics is chairman of the House Education Committee. The scheme is reported to have the blessing of President Kennedy and the so-called liberal Democratic leaders in Congress. It should be pointed out that by liberal is meant excessive liberality with the taxpayers' money.

If there was ever any need for Federal aid to education in this country it is apparent that it has ceased to exist. The States and local communities have demonstrated that they can and will furnish all needed facilities to meet the requirements of an exploding school population. We have a good example of that right here in Sturgis. There has never been a dollar of Federal or State tax money invested in a local school building.

There is no evidence that any child of school age will be deprived of an elementary education for lack of classrooms or teachers. If colleges and universities cannot accommodate all who seek admission the difficulty can be overcome by raising entrance requirements and eliminating, in advance, the 25 to 30 percent of unqualified young men and women

who regard a college education as a symbol of social distinction and flunk out in their first year. There are no reliable statistics, but probably half of the high school graduates who enter our colleges and universities are not benefited by their exposure to higher education and, in fact, are frustrated and delayed in adjusting themselves to a life in which they will be happy and for which they are fitted.

Abraham Lincoln once said that the aggregate of all his classroom schooling did not amount to one year. He was never inside a college or academy building. Yet he educated himself sufficiently to become President of his country, abolish slavery, and write the Gettysburg Address, one of the immortal public documents of all time. He lives in the Nation's affections as a far greater President than any we have had since, including Harvard graduates.

Here's how the masterminds of the New Frontier hope to put over their project for Federal regimentation of public education:

One bill would provide Federal aid for public (not private) elementary school construction linked with Federal aid for schools in impacted areas, meaning schools where local tax revenues are insufficient due to large tax-free Federal installations.

The higher education package would provide Federal aid for college classroom construction and Federal loans for college students. There is an insidious provision in this bill which would forgive borrowers their indebtedness to the Government if they agree to teach in private or public schools for 5 years after graduation. More regimentation.

No decision has been reached as to which package will include the National Defense Education Act, the legislation now in effect under which Federal aid is being provided for improved instruction in the teaching of sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages. There is no evidence that this act has had any noticeable effect on the quality of teaching in the subjects specified.

Neither package will include any provision for Federal aid to private or parochial schools, and no grants will be available to divinity schools.

There are some meritorious provisions in the proposed legislation such as Federal aid to schools in areas where Government projects have brought an influx of population with a resultant dearth of school facilities. This objective can be easily attained by a single bill or an amendment to some related appropriation bill. The few merits in the dual-purpose bills would be offset by the disastrous effect on the educational system as a whole.

If Congress is so confident that their countrymen want Federal subsidization of education why don't they submit the question to a national referendum? The answer is that the welfare staters know that it would be buried now and forever.

Fiscal Irresponsibility and More To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, in the August 25 issue of the Wall Street Journal, indicates how deeply into debt President Kennedy has put us in just 7 months of spending. This is only the beginning of the path that will surely lead to national bank-

ruptcy, if Congress and the people don't put a stop to it.

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of \$1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of \$3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least \$5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a \$1.5 billion surplus you have a \$5.3 billion deficit, the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is \$6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the \$3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of \$10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961-62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue estimate for this year is \$82.4 billion, some \$100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's \$3.9 billion deficit, \$2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the \$6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from \$80.9 billion to more than \$87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than \$800 million of that \$2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its anti-recession program. As for the 1961-62 budget, only \$3.7 billion of the total \$6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of \$10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than \$4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, \$3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining \$6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government and all the rest. That \$6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that \$6.2 billion is \$6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary to take additional action this year and that certainly next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump-priming and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to the urgent needs of defense.

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a \$10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

Interview of Premier Khrushchev by Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by Drew Pearson on his interview with Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, which appears in today's Washington Post, together with the English translation of Mr. Pearson's and Mr. Khrushchev's talk.

Without attempting to comment on the substance of Mr. Khrushchev's statement, it appears to be one of the fullest elaborations of his views on Berlin which has been printed publicly, if not the fullest, and therefore it is of interest to our Government and people.

Mr. Pearson's article is excellent reporting, and he deserves great credit for making it available.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

K. ASSERTS HE'S READY FOR TALKS ON BERLIN
(By Drew Pearson)

GAGRI, GEORGIA, U.S.S.R.—Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, in an exhaustive discussion of the problems of peace and war now facing the United States and the Soviet Union, said he was "ready at any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western Powers" regarding Berlin. "The solution of the problem," he said, "is one which permits no delay."

Khrushchev also made a flat proposal to guarantee the future freedom of West Berlin with a token force of American, British, French and Soviet troops.

[Assistant White House Press Secretary Andrew T. Hatcher said President Kennedy would have no comment on the Pearson interview.]

He said: "I should like to know what the Western Powers would reply to the following concrete proposal: Let the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union jointly give a solemn pledge to respect and protect the freedom, independence, and rights of the free city of West Berlin." He emphasized that troops should be in number, that there must be no interference with the people of West Berlin by any outside power, and that under such agreement there would be complete access to West Berlin over the territory of East Germany.

But if a peace treaty with East Germany is not signed by the former Allied Powers, Khrushchev said, then Allied access to West Berlin could be assured only on the basis of arrangements with the East German Government over whose territory the Allies would have to pass.

Elaborating on this point, Khrushchev told me, "you are now sending 1,500 additional troops to West Berlin, and under present arrangements you can do this. But after a peace treaty is signed and an American colonel seeks to transport his troops across East Germany, he will be told 'No. Occupation has ended. You have no right to transport troops across this territory, either by land, by sea, or by air.'"

"And if, as the American press says, force will be used, that means war."

The man who guides the destiny of 220 million Soviet people and the largest land masses in the world made this new proposal for solving the Berlin crisis beside a swimming pool overlooking the Black Sea, where he recently entertained John McCloy, President Kennedy's disarmament adviser.

The sea, which extends down to Turkey and the famous Bosphorus outlet to the Mediterranean over which so many wars have been waged, looked very peaceful in the afternoon sunlight. And Khrushchev on the whole was in a peaceful mood. He kept repeating over and over that his country and his government wanted peace. But he also made it absolutely clear and repeated it several times that Russia would definitely sign a peace treaty with East Germany. He hoped the United States would join.

"But," he said, "whether you join us or not we are going to sign such a treaty. If you will join us that will bring the greatest happiness to our two peoples."

"We fought together. We routed the Hitlerites together. Let's work in peace together," Khrushchev said.

Our conversation lasted several hours during which the man who probably wields more individual power than any other government leader in the world, talked with nostalgia about his meetings with former President Eisenhower, praised John Foster Dulles regarding his latter-day view on Germany, told how he refused to release the RB-47 fliers during last year's U.S. election because it might help elect Nixon, joked about how he once offered a job to Ambassador Averell Harriman, expressed his appreciation of Mr. Kennedy's frankness at Vienna but his disappointment at his belligerent statements afterward, and said that he had many letters from the Red army wanting to remain on for another "hitch" because of the Berlin war clouds.

Because he was introducing some new ideas on Berlin and because of the touch-and-go nature of the Berlin crisis, Khrushchev furnished me the English translation of our talk. And because of their importance, I am making this text available to all newspapers in the United States.

Summarizing his views, Khrushchev said, "Let us sign a peace treaty. Let us establish a free-city status for West Berlin. Let us provide it with necessary guarantees. We are moreover ready ourselves to participate in exercising those guarantees."

"We are ready to agree to these guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. These should be small in number—literally token troops—because no large numbers of armed forces will be necessary to guarantee free-city status."

"In this case agreement could be reached with the Government of the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) regarding freedom of communication for those military contingents."

"That in effect sums up our position on the German question," Khrushchev concluded. "That is what we are calling for. I should emphasize again and again that we are striving for elimination of vestiges of World War II. We want the atmosphere in Europe and therefore throughout the world to become purer; so that all nations may breathe fresh air; so that all countries shall

live as good neighbors; so that they shall build peaceful relations with one another; so that human beings shall live without fear of war.

"It is for this reason that the Soviet Government and other Socialist countries have finally decided not to postpone any further signing of the German peace treaty. We shall regret it if the Western Powers should not wish to join us. But in that event we shall be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

"You ask when it would be desirable to hold negotiations. The answer is that the solution permits no delay. We are therefore ready any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western powers—if they sincerely desire to achieve a realistic settlement of the German problem on a mutually acceptable basis."

TEXT OF INTERVIEW WITH SOVIET PREMIER

The text of the statement given Washington Columnist Drew Pearson by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev:

"As I understand it, what you call the Berlin crisis are differences between Socialist countries and countries of the West regarding the fate of West Berlin after the conclusion of the German peace treaty. I should like first of all to stress that this question is but a part of the general problem of peaceful settlement with Germany.

"The clamor raised by certain quarters in the West which promotes whipping up of international tensions and military psychosis clearly has the aim of making it difficult to sign a German peace treaty. A start should therefore be made by taking up the major issue—that of a German peace treaty.

"This is all the more important since the proposal of the Soviet Union and a number of the countries which fought against Hitlerite Germany to conclude a peace treaty with two presently existing German states which are legal heirs of former Germany has provoked completely erroneous reaction on the part of Western powers.

"An especially hostile position in this matter is taken up by the Government of West Germany. In this it is supported by the Governments of United States, France, and Britain. According to the Adenauer government they are rejecting reasonable proposals to sign a peace treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, though such treaty in no way affects the interests of the Western Powers.

"Certainly if a united Germany existed such a peace treaty would be signed with it. But at present no such united Germany exists. On the soil of the former Hitlerite Reich, two German states with diametrically opposed economic and political systems have come into being and have taken their own roads of development.

"I do not want to delve into history on this question and give an account of why this happened, though we Soviet people do have something to say on this score. It was United States, Britain, and France who split Germany as far back as 1947 when they carried out a series of economic and political measures to transform their occupation zones first into bizonia, then into trizonia, and finally into the Federal Republic (West) Germany.

"Placed before the fact of appearance in the western part of Germany of a separate state which by the way immediately started to acquire a belligerent revanchard character, the population of East Germany in their turn created another German state, German Democratic Republic, which bore a peace-loving and democratic character.

"Thus, whether we like it or not, there actually exist in central Europe two German states, and it is from this fact that we should proceed. I can but add that the government of the (East) German Democratic Republic has repeatedly sought to per-

sue the government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany to come to the conference table and devise ways leading to the reunification of the German nation. Not one of those attempts has met with success. The Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany has flatly refused to consider any proposals by the German Democratic Republic concerning the creation of a united German state.

"What prompts this position of the West German Government? This can be given but one explanation: In rejecting peaceful unification of the German Nation, the Government of West Germany is contemplating the forcible seizure of (East) German Democratic Republic. Only a blind man can fail to see that the attempt to swallow that republic will not remain unpunished. Indeed, it is not alone. It has its own true allies who will not leave it in time of trouble.

"It is also known that West Germany, too, has her allies with whom it is linked through an aggressive NATO pact. Under these conditions, attack by West Germany against the German Democratic Republic would not be local conflict but would be the start of thermonuclear war without parallel in history, in which all states belonging to two opposing camps would take part.

"How then are we to act in this situation? Are we to wait until Germany reunites, which, as you see, can take place only by means of terrible war, or are we to sign a treaty with two actually existing states without further delay?

"We believe there should be no further delay.

"Signing of a peace treaty which would write fins to a Second World War and legitimize orders of two German states will tie the hands of revenge seekers and discourage them from indulging in gambles. And only contrary, further delay would be interpreted by revanchard quarters of West Germany as encouragement to aggression, to unleashing war.

"It is proceeding from this that we decided to put an end to procrastinations in the question of a German peace treaty. And if the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany continues to refuse to sign such a treaty, it will be signed with the (East) German Democratic Republic, which has already voiced its agreement. The treaty will legitimize borders defined by the Potsdam agreement, and the (East) German Democratic Republic will exercise full sovereignty on its territory, free from the burden of vestiges of World War II.

"Now with regard to the fate of West Berlin, as I already said, the question of West Berlin is part of the general question of signing a German peace treaty. Following the signing of a peace treaty with the (East) German Democratic Republic, West Berlin will receive the status of a free city and will be complete master of its destiny. Its people will live under such social and political system as they themselves want to have. We propose to include a clause in the treaty to the effect that no one shall have the right to interfere in the affairs of West Berlin or impose their order upon its people.

"It would seem that this would completely suit the Western Powers, which have repeatedly declared that the population of West Berlin must have complete freedom and independence in choice of their way of life. Nevertheless the leaders of the Western Powers are vigorously opposing our proposals and in so doing are whipping up unparalleled clamor around the Berlin issue akin to military hysteria.

"What then are they displeased over? They are displeased over the fact that the signing of a German peace treaty and granting of free city status to West Berlin auto-

matically puts an end to occupation status on whose basis their troops are stationed in that city.

"Contrary to plain and firm statements of the governments of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic regarding their readiness to provide West Berlin with any kind of guarantee, the statesmen of the West, notably Adenauer and Brandt, keep alleging that we want to 'seize' West Berlin. It is not in vain that people say that the lie walks on short legs.

"I should like to know what the Western Powers would reply to the following concrete proposal: Let the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union jointly give a solemn pledge to respect and protect the freedom, independence, and rights of the free city of West Berlin.

"I believe you will agree with this. We too agree. Then where are grounds for inflaming passions and whipping up military psychosis around the so-called Berlin question?

"The question remains of freedom of access to West Berlin. As you know it is around this question that adversaries of signing a German peace treaty are raising particular clamor. It is all the more important to give complete clarity to this question.

"We have said, and we repeat, that no one is encroaching on freedom of access to West Berlin. On the contrary, in proposing a conclusion of a German peace treaty we emphasize that freedom of West Berlin's communications must be guaranteed. The West Berlin Government, as any sovereign government, must have the right to maintain diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties with any country of any continent.

"Then where do our differences lie? They lie in the following:

"We want to do away completely with the vestiges of World War II while Western countries—United States, Britain, and France—are clinging in every way possible to those vestiges, seeking thereby to assure their troops access to West Berlin on the basis of occupation rights which stem from the regime of Hitlerite Germany's surrender.

"But one thing does not conform to the others. Ask any lawyer and he will tell you that if a peace treaty is signed then a state of war is terminated. However, if a state of war is terminated, then how can an occupation regime be preserved in West Berlin? This is impossible.

"The sovereign countries of the world—and the German Democratic Republic is of their number—are guided by a universally accepted rule: if their routes of communication with other countries run through the territory of third states then naturally agreement of those third states is always required in order to use those communications, no matter how they may run—on ground, in the air, or across water. This holds good in regard to any country, regardless of what social system it may belong to.

"As an argument against dealing with (East) Germany, some Western personalities protest that they cannot deal with that government since the United States and other Western powers fought against Germany. This argument is completely unfounded. Indeed we too fought and are known to have borne the brunt of war against Germany, including that part of it which today makes up the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Nonetheless we maintain relations with and whenever necessary deal with the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany.

"Let me give you one example which I have already mentioned in one of my speeches. We are now operating a direct railroad service between Moscow and Paris. These trains pass through the territory of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Before signing an agreement with France we naturally approached the Government of

West Germany with a request that it allow transit of trains through its territory, and it was only after agreement was received and appropriate agreements signed that this train service started to operate.

"Thousands of such examples could be adduced. The same rule should also be applied in regard to access to West Berlin after a peace treaty is signed. Respect for sovereignty must be observed with regard to all countries (East) Germany included.

"This rule represents the law of laws and if we start to flout it there will be no stability in the world, there will be no peaceful coexistence of states, and in general there may well be no peace.

"And if certain state and political leaders say: Let the Soviet Union and other countries sign a peace treaty while leaving the Western Powers that right of access to West Berlin which stems from occupation status, they are wishing for the impossible. When a peace treaty is signed it is quite natural that rights of conquering powers which stem from surrender of conquered country come to an end.

"Two German states with which a peace treaty will be signed will from then on be completely sovereign. And regardless of whether or not other countries like the regime existing in one or the other of them, they shall have to maintain relations with them in conformity with the generally accepted standards of international law.

"It might be opportune in this connection to recall what transpired at the time of the signing of the peace treaty with Japan. Together with the United States we fought against Japan. The Soviet Army routed the main nucleus of Japanese troops, the Kwantung army in Manchuria. After the surrender of Japan, the Soviet Union together with the United States and other allies, devised measures to control postwar development of Japan.

"Soviet representatives took the most active part in the work of the Allied Council in Tokyo. When, however, the question arose of concluding peace, the United States signed a separate treaty, disregarding the Soviet Union. They unilaterally liquidated the Allied Council for Japan and started to oust Soviet representatives from Tokyo. And though we had rights and commitments which stemmed from the fact of Japan's surrender, our allies disregarded them.

"Why then are the United States and their Allies now trying to describe as illegal our intention to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic in the event that Western Powers refuse to join us in a peace treaty with two German states? What suits the United States they declare to be legitimate, but what does not suit the United States they call illegal. Is this logical?

"Thus it is quite evident that the Western Powers are artificially whipping up a dispute around the Berlin question by injecting a spirit of war hysteria in order to aggravate international tensions still further and create a pretext to unleash war against the Soviet Union and the Socialist camp as a whole. Arguments that they are allegedly fighting to preserve freedom and independence of population of West Berlin are false through and through, since no one is menacing that freedom and independence.

We are saying: Let us sign a peace treaty, let us establish free city status for West Berlin, let us provide it with all necessary guarantees. We are moreover ready ourselves to participate in the exercise of those guarantees. We are also ready to agree to these guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

These should be small numbers, literally token troops, because no large number of armed forces will be necessary there in order

to guarantee free city status. In that case, agreement could be reached with the Government of the German Democratic Republic regarding freedom of communication for those military contingents.

That in effect sums up our position on the German question. That is what we are calling for.

I should like again and again to emphasize that we are striving for elimination of vestiges of World War II. We want the atmosphere in Europe and therefore throughout the world to become purer so that all nations shall live as good neighbors, so that they shall build peaceful relations with one another, so that human beings shall live without fear of war.

It is for this reason that the Soviet Government and governments of other Socialist countries which took part in the war against Hitlerite Germany have firmly decided not to postpone any further signing of a German peace treaty. We will regret it if Western Powers should not wish to join us in signing a peace treaty. But in that event we will be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

You ask when it would be desirable to hold negotiations. The answer is that solution of the question permits no delay. We are therefore ready at any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western Powers on this matter if they have a sincere desire to achieve realistic settlement of the German problem on a mutually acceptable basis.

To this I should add that they no less than we—and perhaps even more so—should be interested in having this problem peacefully solved and if leaders of Western Powers, notably President Kennedy, want such settlement we have declared long ago that we are always ready to come to the round-table for peaceful negotiations.

And the Sixth Edition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the author of perhaps the most widely used basic economics text in America's colleges and is one of the New Frontier's thought leaders in the field of economics. Professor Samuelson's "Economics: An Introductory Analysis" was published first in 1948 and as time has progressed, so has Professor Samuelson's text. Economic Intelligence, the monthly report of the economic research department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in its August 1961 issue noted the progress that the professor's text, and apparently the professor, have made during the years from the first through the fifth edition and since. I join the editors of Economic Intelligence in looking forward to a sixth edition of Professor Samuelson's work.

REGRESSING INFLATION

A. "If price increases could be held down to, say, less than 5 percent per year, such as mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Paul A. Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 1st ed., 1948.)

B. "If price increases could be held down to, say, less than 5 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great

concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 2d ed., 1951.)

C. "If price increases could be held down to, say, less than 3 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 3d ed., 1955.)

D. "If price increases could be held down to, say, 2 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 4th ed., 1958.)

E. "Price increases that could be held down below 2 percent per year are one thing. But . . ."—Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 5th ed., 1961.)

F. "If we can hold things down so that the official index of prices goes up by no more than 1.5 or 2 percent, I shall be very content."—Samuelson, Meet the Press, March 5, 1961.

Many people hope that Professor Samuelson will keep on talking and that his book will go through many more editions.

Seven Months of New Frontier Spending Bodes Ill for the Future of Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Wall Street Journal is a sharp reminder of the reckless spending in which the New Frontier has plunged the Nation. Unless this trend is reversed we can expect bigger deficits, greater inflation, and higher taxes. The economy cannot stand many more months of administration sponsored spending programs:

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of \$1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of \$3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totaled up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least \$5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a \$1.5 billion surplus you have a \$5.3 billion deficit the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is \$6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the \$3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of \$10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961-62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue esti-

mate for the year is \$82.4 billion, some \$100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's \$3.9 billion deficit, \$2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the \$6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from \$80.9 billion to more than \$87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than \$800 million of that \$2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961-62 budget, only \$3.7 billion of the total \$6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of \$10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than \$4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, \$3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining \$6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government and all the rest. That \$6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that \$6.2 billion is \$6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary "to take additional action this year" and that certainly next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump-priming and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to the urgent needs of defense.

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a \$10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the continuing disturbing developments in the Berlin crisis and the anticipated eruptions in other parts of the world, civil defense operations have undergone considerable review and adjustment. As we move to improve the operations in this field, it is well for us to remember the inconsistencies and problems of the past in order that they not be repeated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a most practical commentary from the August 6 issue of the Southtown Economist, of Chicago, containing its observations on civil defense history in a penetrating editorial entitled "Merry-Go-Round":

MERRY-GO-ROUND

Mayor Daley, in compliance with a request from Washington, has ordered a stepped-up program of so-called civil defense measures. Whether the outcome will be the building of underground shelters at a cost of millions of dollars, reviving the distribution of pamphlets telling the public what to do in the event of an air raid, and similar measures which withered because of the lack of public interest, will not be known until the plan is announced.

What should be obvious, however, is not mentioned. Some cities that went into civil defense in a big way posted signs on roads leading into the country designating the roads as air raid exits.

Since all of our expressways, boulevards, and principal thoroughfares in the Chicago area are jammed to the point of congestion during the morning and evening rush hours, and no solution to that problem has been put into effect, how will those exits be able to carry a mass exodus if one is ordered?

Civil defense is one of those things that sounds good in theory, but it just doesn't work out in practice.

The net result of the new campaign can be another boost in taxes to provide the money for the cost of the measures to be proposed.

As a test of the efficacy of civil defense campaigns to date, ask yourself whether you know what to do in the event the next siren blast is the real thing.

Wheat Referendum—Just a Sample of What Might Have Been

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Red Wing Republican Eagle of Red Wing, Minn., was alert enough to come out editorially on August 25 with what I believe are some acute and accurate observations on the Department of Agriculture's recent wheat referendum.

The concern of the newspaper was not over the result of the vote, but rather the very active campaigning by Department of Agriculture officials to influence the farmer's vote. They draw from this activity, an analogy of just what the Department of Agriculture would probably do if the Congress had given them authority to set up farmer committees and then conduct referendum votes on various agricultural programs for individual farm products.

I recommend this editorial to my fellow Members:

FARM REFERENDUMS WEIGHTED?

Millard Nelson, Pierce County's ASC office manager at Ellsworth, is described in Wednesday's Daily Republican Eagle as warning what would happen to farm income if farmers had voted "no" in Thursday's wheat referendum. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a Minneapolis speech last week, strongly urged a "yes" vote. Freeman is pictured in the Farmers Union Herald holding a big "vote yes" poster.

This sort of thing illustrates, in our opinion, what would be likely to happen under the Kennedy administration's "omnibus farm bill," whose key provisions Con-

gress wisely deleted but whose "supply management" concepts are still very much in the minds of the USDA's present top management.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture was to appoint farmers who would advise him in developing programs, with production and marketing controls, for each farm commodity. Before any controls could take effect, farmers affected would have to approve in a referendum. But if USDA and its handpicked committees formulate the programs, if the ASC arm of the USDA conducts the elections, and if ASC and the USDA's top dogs also campaign for yes votes, won't the results be rather weighted toward one side? Ordinarily the agency conducting an election maintains at least a semblance of neutrality on how voters ought to vote.

What It Means To Be a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Saturday, my colleague in the Senate, FRANCIS CASE; Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and BEN REIFEL, of our State, and I were privileged to attend and address the South Dakota Young Republican Convention in Brookings, S. Dak. South Dakota is the home State of the national chairman of the Young Republican League and young Republicanism plays a vital part in the political affairs of our great State which responds in practice to its proud motto, "Under God the people rule."

Under leave of the Senate, therefore, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared for delivery to this convention by the newest Member of our congressional delegation, the very able Representative, BEN REIFEL, of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. BEN REIFEL, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AT SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, DELEGATION LUNCHEON, 12 NOON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1961, BROOKINGS COUNTRY CLUB

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, just about a year ago I appeared briefly before you at Sioux Falls as a green candidate making his first venture into the arena of politics.

Now I am back before you, still green, not too much of a politician but a little bit wiser, I hope, a good deal more fearful for the future of our country and a great deal more thankful for Republicans—especially Young Republicans.

Out of that meeting a year ago came a new army of enthusiastic young workers for the Republican cause. And I want to say right now that, without your help, KARL, E.Y., and I might not be in Washington representing you, and Archie Fubbrud might not have had the opportunity to bring good government back to the South Dakota Statehouse. We all are indebted to you.

I remember the way young Republicans, including high school youngsters, came into my campaign headquarters in Aberdeen and offered to put up posters or run errands or

do anything they could. I remember the way young Republicans led the welcome for Nixon at the plowing contest and paraded in the rain for Archie at Sioux Falls. I remember how they worked in our tents at the fairs, swelled the crowds at rallies and hauled people to the polls on election day.

The same thing was happening all over the country, and others tell me it is growing and picking up steam yet today. Young people's rejection of the principle of the welfare state, the cradle-to-the-grave philosophy, the idea that Uncle Sam can spend your money for you better than you can—this has been one of the few encouraging signs I have seen since going to Washington last January.

And I think KARL, and FRANCIS and E.Y.—as well as that walking example of the national resurgence of conservatism who will address you tomorrow, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas—will back me up when I say that the only thing you young people have in common with the national administration and its policies is that there's a young man in the White House, too. And judging by the reception he is receiving around the country and even in his own party, he may not be there in 1965.

Some of the lofty ideals I took to Washington have become a bit shaken by what I found there in the past 8 months. And some of the high-sounding statements we heard last fall and in the early days of the administration have a hollow ring when compared with actual deeds.

The American people were asked to make sacrifices in the name of their country. It appears that those sacrifices will fall most heavily on you young people in the form of higher taxes and less earning power in the future in order to finance foreign and domestic giveaway programs today. It appears that many of our young people will be called upon to take up arms, some of you for a second or third time, to face up to a Berlin crisis that might have been avoided had firm words been backed up by firm action in Laos and Cuba.

"Ask not what your country can do for you" we were told. Uncle Sam will do it anyway, if all the welfare programs go through. He'll pay your wages when you're unemployed, pay you extra if you have children, pay your medical and hospital bills when you're sick, give you surplus food when you're hungry, build you a house for hardly anything down and 35 years to pay, educate your children without Government controls, and pay you a pension when you're old.

The only thing you have to worry about is getting buried when you die. And, Khrushchev has said he'll take care of that.

Our form of government was planned so there would be separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Yet this administration offered us a farm bill that—before the Democrats themselves changed it—would make Congress nothing more than a rubberstamp for programs devised by the Secretary of Agriculture and handpicked advisory committees.

Our Constitution says, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Who is to make the appropriations? The Congress.

Yet this administration offered us a foreign aid bill that would give State Department bureaucrats a free hand for 5 years to dip into the Federal Treasury in support of the development loan projects they created overseas. Only once in 5 years would Congress be able to take a look at the program and say, "What are you doing with all that money? Where is it going and what results are we getting?"

Again, Democrats in Congress themselves had to rise up against their own President and, in the House at least, we succeeded in knocking out such authority.

On October 3, 1960, Candidate Kennedy said it is important to have a balanced budget. In 6 months in office the Democrats added more than 67,000 new employees to the Federal payroll. Due to massive Federal spending last year's Federal budget went from a prospective surplus of \$3.9 billion in the red. For the current fiscal year the administration officially predicts a deficit of over \$5 billion. But it looks more like \$7 billion. Currently we are spending \$1 million an hour more than we are taking in.

We were told gently in the President's television address on the Berlin crisis that, due to increased defense needs, we might have to cut down on some domestic programs. Congress agreed and we voted him every penny he wanted to step up our defenses.

But to this day not one single request for new or expanded domestic programs has been withdrawn; in fact, the pace of the lobbying has been stepped up. And of the extra \$10 billion he wants above Eisenhower's 1962 estimates, 44 percent is for non-military programs.

These are the type of things that disturb me about the current administration in Washington. What a contrast to the kind of taxpayer-first, down-to-earth, fiscally responsible government we have here in South Dakota under a well-grounded Republican Governor and a Republican-controlled legislature.

That's why it's such a pleasure to attend a gathering like this today and have the realization that these things have not gone unnoticed by the youth of our State or country.

Oftentimes we hear it said that the youth of today is going physically soft. The President has even proposed a national program to get them to exercise.

But I'm not half so worried about that as I am that we as a people are going morally soft—that we have forgotten what it is to do for ourselves those things that we can best do for ourselves, that we don't have the gumption to stand up and oppose creeping socialism and the welfare state, that we're content to let ourselves be pushed around by little tyrants 90 miles off our shore and by a bigger tyrant whose sole aim is world domination for his atheistic, freedom-suppressing cause.

I don't think the people of South Dakota and particularly the youth of South Dakota subscribe to that kind of softness. Maybe we're old-fashioned and provincial and out of step to believe in an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, a State government that pays as it goes, and freedom with justice and dignity for all, even if we have to fight for it. I don't think so and I know you don't. We have fought for those principles before and we are willing to do so again if necessary.

That's why the Republican Party is growing each day in strength and vigor.

These are the things Republicans stand for and believe in.

With your help and the help of thousands like you we can make these things endure.

Desalinization Stride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like

to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the August 19, 1961, issue of the States-Item of New Orleans:

DESALINIZATION STRIDE

As though in anticipation of Senate hearings scheduled to begin Tuesday, a New Orleans firm announces significant breakthrough in converting salt water to pure.

Employing a revolutionary process to solve the problem of scaling and corrosion in saline water conversion, the Mechanical Equipment Co. claims a 40-percent reduction in the cost of such operation.

This should win hearty approval from the Kennedy administration in view of its research efforts in that direction.

Progress by the New Orleans firm will be particularly welcomed by Interior Secretary Udall, who will appear Tuesday before the Senate Interior Committee.

The committee will be weighing President Kennedy's request for unlimited research in saline water conversion against the ominous prediction that shortages of fresh water will affect every region of the United States by 1975.

This estimate was prepared by the office of saline water, established by the Saline Water Act of 1952.

Current U.S. consumption of fresh water, according to the agency, amounts to 312 billion gallons a day—45 percent for industry, 45 percent for agriculture, and 10 percent for household uses.

Total available supply, which is expected to be overtaken by demand within 15 years, amounts to 515 billion gallons a day.

Mechanical Equipment Co.'s new method completely eliminates scale and almost does away with corrosion in the converter by making it possible to boil seawater at about 107° F. rather than 212°.

Units featuring the new process will produce 10,000 gallons of pure, fresh water a day either from brackish wells or seawater.

Spelling out the importance of salt water conversion is a recent statement by President Kennedy:

"If we could ever completely, at a cheap rate, get fresh water from salt water . . . it would be in the long-range interest of humanity [and] . . . would really dwarf any other scientific achievement."

The breakthrough engineered by New Orleans private enterprise is a stride in that direction.

Understanding of Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a selection from the letter concerning a former constituent, written by Mrs. Robert L. Schwartz. Her laudatory remarks reveal a man of most estimable qualities and one whom I have been proud to know:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I am writing to you about a mutual friend our ours—Rabbi Benjamin Cohen, formerly of East St. Louis, Ill., now of Los Angeles, Calif.

The rabbi has never met me personally, but was introduced to me and my family here in Stamford by my younger sister, who recently moved to Los Angeles and is a member of his congregation. She had told

him of our older sister's illness: multiple sclerosis, in an advanced stage, and no medication used throughout the 8 known years of the illness has thus far had any effect. About 4 or 5 months ago Rabbi Cohen started corresponding with our sick sister, Mrs. David Adelkopf, of Stamford. At the same time he held special services on her behalf, about which our younger sister, Mrs. Paul Zaharia, of Los Angeles, wrote us glowingly. The sister on our sister's morale is astounding. (Nothing miraculous has occurred, which in medical terminology could be construed as a remission—one of the fortunate phases of multiple sclerosis—for which we've prayed all these many years.) But the mere fact that a rabbi chose on his own to take such a deep, personal interest in a stranger stricken with such a pathetic illness, thousands of miles away, moves her to renewed hope that the latest treatment her doctor is using on her at this time, will prove the exception and bring about the longed-for remission.

I, Mrs. Robert Schwartz, am the family correspondent on behalf of Mrs. Adelkopf. In the many letters and post cards the rabbi has written to us, he mentions so many, many others whom he prays for constantly, it is obvious he is unique in giving of himself so selflessly is sufficient to make others turn to God for help and faith.

Rabbi Benjamin Cohen has such a true understanding of human needs and such a selfless desire to help those in difficulty as best he can; he puts me in mind of the definition of the epitome of perfection of his calling, viz:

During World War II, there was a theological panel for selective service headquarters, New York City, whose purpose it was to select the bona fide claimants for IV-D deferment, from the mass of students attending the theological seminaries in this area. I was the stenographer for said panel, which was composed of prominent Judges Jonah Goldstein, Samuel Null, Samuel Levy, now deceased, Irving Kaufmann, etc. Rabbis Leo Jung, Joseph Lookstein, Abraham Solomon, Joseph Goldstein, and many prominent lay-people, such as Dr. Alexander Dushkin, formerly of the Jewish Education Committee for New York, and in recent years one of the founders of the University of Israel. I recall that these men gave of their time freely and willingly and in special Sunday morning session, one of the registrants held the rapt attention of the panel for 3 hours, narrating his unusual experiences and circumstances. He was no ordinary seminary student, born and reared in our magnificent country—on the contrary, he was a native of Warsaw, Poland, and had such a burning desire to be a rabbi that he managed to escape Hitler's Warsaw ghetto and by sheer faith survived pursuit through Russia, via the Orient, into Japan and finally into the United States and on the west coast. Ironically, when he migrated to New York and resumed his formal studies, he was drafted into the U.S. Army, but the panel's conclusion deferred him from service.

Of course, Rabbi Cohen's experiences cannot be compared to those of the aforementioned victim of Nazi oppression, but the burning desire to serve God in whatever way they can and to the best of their ability—often under trying circumstances testing their humble way of living to the utmost—led me to write to you about him.

Thank you for your time and consideration, sir. I truly appreciate your listening.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT L. SCHWARTZ.

Gen. E. R. Quesada Discusses Air Safety Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Gen. E. R. "Pete" Quesada, the distinguished former head of the Federal Aviation Agency, discussed some serious problems of air safety in an interview with Edward W. O'Brien, chief of the Globe-Democrat Washington Bureau, which was printed on August 2, 1961, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. By careful research and followup of records, Mr. O'Brien has documented one instance of the type of air safety problem that General Quesada has been warning us about. Increasingly disturbing reports regarding FAA enforcement of air safety standards have been circulated throughout the industry since General Quesada left his post as FAA Administrator. Because the average air traveler has no organized spokesman in Washington, it is necessary for all of us, especially in the Congress, to listen carefully to the warnings of General Quesada regarding the increasing number of unsolved air safety problems. Mr. O'Brien, by hard work and initiative, has obtained the facts on one serious accident. Other similar accidents and near-misses must be fully reported and explored by the press. Because so many persons fly each day, it is important that this subject be closely studied and that the best reportorial talent available be brought to bear on this problem.

PLANE CARRYING 107 HITS TREE: GENERAL QUESADA CRITICIZES FAA LAXITY IN DISCIPLINING PILOT

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—On a rainy dawn in April a Delta jet with 107 people aboard landed at Detroit Airport with part of a 5-inch-thick tree sticking out of the right wing.

Investigation showed the plane, a DC-8, had struck a 48-foot-high tree more than a mile from the end of the runway the pilot thought he was approaching.

The pilot, Eugene Fletcher, of Miami, Fla., believed he had hit some birds. Nonetheless, he revved up the engines when he felt the thud and pulled up for a circle around the airport.

On the second try he landed safely, but with large gashes showing on the wing. The embedded log was 4 feet long.

The next day, April 17, Pilot Fletcher was suspended from flight duty by the airline for 60 days.

The Federal Aviation Agency, charged with air safety, began its own investigation.

Last week FAA found him guilty of operating the plane, with its 100 passengers and crew of 7, "in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the life and property of others."

"By reason of your actions, you failed to exercise at all times the degree of care, skill, judgment, and responsibility required of an

airline transport pilot," the FAA letter to Mr. Fletcher said.

FAA's penalty: a 60-day suspension of his pilot rating, to coincide with the company suspension already carried out.

"Since the suspension is retroactive, no further action on your part is required," the FAA letter said.

What FAA meant was that the Government had no additional penalty to impose.

On Tuesday, the man who retired last January as Chief of FAA, retired Air Force Gen. Elwood R. Quesada, scorched FAA's decision not to take further action against Mr. Fletcher.

"Judging from what I know of the case, it was a gross miscarriage. The public's interest was not served," he told the Globe-Democrat.

"The pilot's error and poor judgment were gross."

"A tragedy of the first order was avoided not by his ability but by an act of providence."

The flight was nonstop from Miami, and the pilot was supposed to be landing on instruments.

According to FAA, the glide path he was following at the Detroit airport is fully covered by radio navigation aids extending several miles out and providing horizontal and vertical guidance practically to the ground.

General Quesada, who brought a new era of strict enforcement to civil aviation, accused the pilot of disregard of cockpit discipline and of failure to make proper use of the cockpit instrumentation on which the Government has spent millions of dollars.

The general, now the head of the Washington Senators baseball team, said he regards the pilot's error as just as great as if the tragedy were complete—that is, if the plane had crashed with 107 dead.

General Quesada limited most of his comments to this case, but it is known around Washington he has continued an intense interest in air regulation since leaving the Government in January.

"I am concerned over the apparent weakening of the enforcement program," he told the Globe-Democrat.

His successor is Najeeb E. Halaby.

FAA said that immediately after Mr. Fletcher landed on April 16, it checked its instrument landing aids around the field and found them operating normally.

Just before the landing, a special weather forecast had been broadcasting warning of rain and fog with a 500-foot ceiling and a mile-and-one-half visibility. FAA said Mr. Fletcher claimed he never heard the broadcast.

The Facts of Nuclear Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast in the public interest over radio station WBZ and WBZ-TV, in Boston, Mass.:

THE FACTS OF NUCLEAR LIFE

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ-TV)

The facts of modern nuclear warfare are grim and horrifying. Official estimates are that a first attack on Strategic Air Command bases and 50 major cities right now would produce 90 million casualties. The scope of such a disaster is almost beyond our comprehension. And for that reason many people have blindly closed their eyes to the danger.

But this head-in-the-sand attitude can't be tolerated any longer. Admittedly, the situation is grim. But it's not hopeless. The time has come for positive action.

To help in this, WBZ-Radio has undertaken a comprehensive public service program called "Operation Survival." Its aim is to educate the public about fallout shelters, which offer the Nation its best hope for survival in the event of an atomic war.

With even a minimum shelter program, it's estimated the toll from an enemy attack would be cut by 10 to 15 million lives. The better the shelter program, the lower the toll would be. Some experts believe it could even be cut down as low as 5 million.

The cost of shelter program will be high, very high. But then what is more precious than life itself? And a shelter program would make it possible to save lives by the millions.

Government will help in providing shelters, both directly and indirectly. But initiative must be taken by private citizens, people like you and me.

The simplest type of shelter can be built in your home basement for \$200 to \$250. Better and more comfortable shelters can be had for more. The one fact to keep in mind is this: The more shielding you have, the more protection you'll have, not only from fallout but from effects of the blast itself.

As part of its "Operation Survival," WBZ-Radio has helped prepare a test shelter on an island in Boston Harbor. Five young men are now living there under conditions similar to those that would be encountered after a nuclear attack. They are proving that life can go on in cramped, dark quarters.

If an attack should come suddenly, life can go on for you and your family, too, if you have an adequate shelter.

Information on shelter is readily available from civil defense offices. Call your own local civil defense office today. Or if you prefer, write to Post Office Box Home Shelter, Battle Creek, Mich.

Your life and this country's future depend on being prepared. Don't delay getting ready any longer.

Statement of Hon. Howard Buffett, of Omaha, Nebr., Member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, August 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, one of Nebraska's foremost citizens and a former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Howard Buffett, of Omaha, Nebr., appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, August 19, 1961.

Mr. Buffett served four terms in the House of Representatives and at the close of the 82d Congress retired to conduct his investment business. He has made a long and careful study of foreign aid and its many ramifications.

Mr. Buffett is a member of the National Committee of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. His statement to the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations follows:

It is the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee's belief that foreign aid incites legal Federal embezzlement of the dollar savings of the American people.

Four headings outline the testimony in support of this premise.

1. The Congress is vested by the Constitution with the power to regulate the value of our money.

2. With some short interruptions, Congress has regulated the dollar downward since 1938.

3. As long as foreign aid continues, Congress is constrained to regulate the value of the dollar downward.

4. If foreign aid is continued, then out of respect for the right to know, the American people who are unversed in monetary manipulation should be fully advised by the Congress that the value of their savings in fixed dollar obligations is being persistently diminished.

Paraphrasing my presentation may seem to reveal an especial interest in the integrity of Congress. As a former Member, and in respect for the constitutional supremacy of the legislative branch of government, I readily admit my concern on this score.

Congressional continuation of the policy of deficit spending, plus immeasurable guarantees and credit arrangements of various kinds, amount to deliberate regulation of the value of the dollar downward.

When such dilution is done without fully informing the people of the inevitable effects of such action, the only truly accurate label for it is legal Federal embezzlement. It is embezzlement of all unwary citizens by a Federal body, the Congress of the United States.

The fact that other branches of our Government, plus foreign governments, and private groups have pressured Congress to take the actions that diminish the dollar's value is no defense. The final responsibility is on Congress alone.

All these facts you already know. But their importance makes their restatement imperative. We all know that when parliamentary institutions fall into disgrace, freedom itself is the next victim. The danger is not imaginary.

At all costs, I urge you to defend the integrity and good name of Congress in all future actions involving the value of the dollar.

In my introduction, I set out four propositions. Nos. 1 and 2 are simple statements of fact. A demonstration of the amount or percentage that the value of the dollar has been regulated downward seems unnecessary.

So I go on to my third point; the proposition that as long as foreign aid continues, Congress is constrained to regulate the value of our money downward.

People unversed in the realities of politics might question this proposition. But anyone who knows the facts of life about elective officials that control taxes and spending will not. More significantly any thoughtful person who understands the principle of fairplay will not.

This situation can best be portrayed by a homey illustration.

No father could long play Santa Claus for

children in other parts of town and Old Scrooge at home. Neither can Congressmen vote continually to spend billions of American tax dollars abroad and at the same time vote for austere economy at home.

Moreover, it is probably unfair and certainly it is unrealistic to expect Congressmen to long oppose ostensibly compassionate schemes to bring additional tax dollars back into their own districts—when the Congress is taking out of their constituents' pockets millions of dollars for foreign groups having no legal or moral claim against American citizens.

The evidence supporting this conclusion is overwhelming. Let us look at the record of the last 8 years under a reputedly conservative administration. That record was tabulated and released by your chairman March 1. He reports:

"Notwithstanding the fact that Federal revenues for the past 8 years exceeded by \$53 billion, the total revenues received in the 164 years from President George Washington to President Harry Truman, inclusive, we borrowed an additional \$23 billion during the same 8-year period and spent that."

Gigantic as the spending of the Eisenhower administration was, it is already evident that it will be quickly surpassed. The forecast of things to come is seen in the frequent headlines indicating quick passage of new spending proposals.

Nor are the conservative Midlands of America immune to the domestic spending pressures engendered by foreign aid.

In my hometown, Omaha, we elected a new mayor in May. In his campaign, the winning candidate embraced the doctrine that if the Federal Government can spend billions on foreign aid, it is his duty to obtain additional Federal funds for Omaha.

Note these paragraphs from his platform:

"In general it has been my philosophy, backed by proof, that community projects can best be taken care of by the community itself, without resort to Federal aid and its accompanying supervision.

"But with the Federal Government spending billions of dollars for foreign aid each year, it is well to remember the truism, 'charity begins at home.'

"If Federal funds are available to pay for low-cost housing for the many senior citizens well able to take care of themselves with dignity, we should take immediate advantage of them.

"To relegate people victimized by heavy taxation and inflation to institutions once their earning years have passed is inexcusable.

Midwestern people are conservative. Sometimes we are slow to catch on. But after 16 years of foreign aid and the hog trough behavior it engenders in domestic spending, that condition compels us to abandon principle. That seems to be the Omaha mayor's conclusion. Who can justly quarrel with it?

Rather than burden you with more evidence on this point, I urge you to ponder the effect of foreign aid on the morals and morale of the American people.

That brings me to the fourth point, my plea for fairness to Americans who are unskilled on money matters. If foreign aid is not to be stopped quickly, these people should now be given facts that have too long been kept obscure.

The great majority of the victims of regulating the value of our money downward are the less affluent and more trusting of our citizens.

Surely Congress has a moral and legal obligation to them that is prior to any promises or pledges our officials have contracted abroad.

Congress should tell these citizens that governmental inflation is in reality legal Federal embezzlement of all savings payable in

a fixed number of dollars, such as Government bonds.

It should be explained to them that so far diminution of the value of the dollar has been somewhat slowed down by subsidy schemes, official reassurances, and propaganda. Most of all it has been restrained by the patient faith of the innocent victims who excite my concern.

Since 1939 the purchasing value of the savings of the thrifty Americans then invested in Government bonds, building and loan shares, pensions, annuities and life insurance have been cut in half, and then some.

Moreover this confiscation took place during a period when the Government was drenching the American people with advertising and sales promotion praising its bonds and the dollar with such claims as "There's no safer security anywhere."

Today the only persons in the world who have power to stop this Federal embezzlement of innocent people is Congress. Either you stop it, or it goes on until the institutions of republican government are discredited and then vitiated.

You have an awesome responsibility. I know something of the pressures to continue foreign aid spending. Among those against you and the great numerical majority of frugal and trustful citizens are the following groups:

1. Debtors of all kinds and descriptions, whose original obligations, contracted in dollars of higher purchasing power, become smaller and smaller as the value of the dollar goes down and down. This group gains most of what the thrifty classes lose.

2. The majority of promoters and speculators, who understand the workings of Federal embezzlement, and arrange their financial affairs to profit from it.

3. Those enterprises and officials who profit from the reckless spending policies that stem out of foreign aid and its domestic consequences.

4. Union bosses who have exploited currency finagling to entrench and expand their power. Union labor that is promised, and usually receiving, protection from a peril they do not understand, pay additional fees and dues willingly.

The foregoing groups have a vested interest in the continuation of foreign aid because it practically guarantees continuous destruction of the value of the dollar. In fairness, we recognize that there is also a significant number of intellectual and sincere people who believe in foreign aid for more creditable reasons. These people believe that foreign aid brings permanent political strength to other lands and that America has the intellectual, moral, political and economic capacity to do it successfully.

I differ with them on all four counts, but I have discussed only one—our proven inability to carry on this policy without relentless dilution of the value of the dollar.

To those who feel that the mutual security program is a must, even if it ruins the dollar, I offer a bit of history.

After World War I France set out on a program of mutual security. They were determined that if war with Germany came again, they would have allies. Probably they also thought that their mutual security program, like our officials tell us, would prevent war.

What did they do?

France made loan after loan to 10 nations that formed a circle around Germany. A few short years went by. Again the war clouds gathered in central Europe.

How did France's mutual security program work out?

Five of France's mutual security allies fought on Germany's side. Four of them were overrun by Hitler's army in jig time. Number 10 in her mutual security alliance

was Turkey. The Turks carefully preserved their neutrality—despite the loans and pledges.

What did this kind of spending do to the thrifty savings of the French people? When I asked former Premier Paul Reynaud that question a few years ago he replied, in five words, "Oh, they were wiped out" and went on quickly to another subject.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, do not let that happen here.

Favors Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the first annual convention of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns on May 27, 1961, a policy statement outlining league objectives was adopted by the delegates. Section 5 of that policy statement dealt with Federal-local relations. The statement makes a good deal of sense and I agree with the expressed sentiments. I am in favor of a Department of Urban Affairs, proposed by President Kennedy, and believe that such an agency will be effective in resolving the many procedural difficulties that Federal aid programs present to municipalities.

I ask permission to have a copy of this section printed with my remarks in the Appendix:

SECTION 5—FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

A. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The Federal Government has adopted a number of aid programs, the intent and purpose of which are to make available Federal funds for the programing and construction of a wide range of local facilities. Such programs include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Federal planning advances, HHFA, section 702, Public Law 560; (b) Federal assistance for school construction, Public Law 815; (c) Federal civil defense contributions program, Civil Defense Act of 1950; (d) urban planning assistance, HHFA, section 701, Public Law 560; (e) airports, Federal Airport Act; (f) small watershed projects, Public Law 566, as amended; (g) public facilities loans programs, Public Law 345; (h) urban renewal, Housing Acts of 1949, 1954, 1957, and 1959; (i) sewerage treatment aid, Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956; (j) rural library services, Library Services Act; (k) hospital construction, Hill-Burton Act, 1946; (l) Federal highway program, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959; (m) land for recreation and public purposes, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, as amended by the acts of 1954 and 1959; (n) National Guard Armory construction, National Defense Facilities Act of 1950; (o) beach erosion control, River and Harbors Act of 1932, together with other legislation pertinent thereto.

In enacting these aid programs, the Federal Government geared the allocation of such funds to certain considerations and conditions, few of which seem to be consistent with one another. While some of the programs are administered by the same agency, there are many agencies involved in these aid programs, with national and regional offices located according to their own operating needs.

B. THE MASSACHUSETTS SITUATION

New England has long been considered as a natural unit because of both its geography and its economy. The six States which comprise the region have worked together continuously through the years in the pursuance of a large number of common interests both public and private. The New England Council, New England Board of Higher Education, New England Building Officials Conference, New England Colleges Fund, and many other groups, too numerous to mention, are indicative of the degree of cooperation which presently exists in the region. Just as the region has long been considered a natural one, so has Boston been considered as its natural center, because of its central location and the availability of water, rail, air, and highway access to it from anywhere in the region.

Currently, New England municipalities which wish to take advantage of any of the various Federal aid programs find it necessary for their officials to contact representatives of a great many Federal agencies. A municipal official seeking information and aid under any of these programs may find it necessary to travel extensively to a number of Government centers, including the District of Columbia, and to talk with many different Federal officials. In doing so, he will find that the regulations governing the submission and approval of project applications vary considerably with the agencies involved.

C. MASSACHUSETTS' MUNICIPAL POLICY

Whereas the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns is desirous of more efficient procedures with respect to Federal-local programs:

Therefore, every effort should be made to simplify the regulations and administrative procedures required under aid programs. To this end, the league urges the Federal Government to adopt a system of standard operating procedures (insofar as it is possible to do so) which may be common to all Federal agencies in carrying out aid programs of benefit to local communities, such simplification of administrative procedures accruing to the advantage of both Federal and local governments; and

Further, that it is recommended that an agency of the Federal Government be established in New England, and preferably in the city of Boston, capable of directing from a single headquarters these aid programs. Such central office would be of great benefit in the processing of applications and progress reports for the entire region; and

Finally, that it is strongly urged that the Members of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States support legislation creating a Department of Urban Affairs, with a Cabinet level administrator in the executive branch of the Government.

The Tone's the Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Harlan Trott, correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Oakland, Calif., has written an interesting and absorbing story in the May 23 edition of that paper pertaining to violinmaking. The title of the story is "The Tone's the Thing."

In it he recites the very interesting history of a Scottish craftsman, Frank DeVoney of Greenock, who discovered the secret of the great violinmakers and met the tests of the great musicians of his day.

The story is not only worth reading but it is worth preserving and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEY TO VIOLINMAKING: THE TONE'S THE THING

(By Harlan Trott)

OAKLAND, CALIF.—Bessie Duncan DeVoney is a prim, precise, pleasant little woman with a closet full of fiddles—and a heart full of devotion to her Scottish father who made them.

String one up and play it, she insists and it will flood the room with the sublime sounds of a Stradivarius, a Guarnerius, an Amati, or a Bergonzi.

A retired legal secretary, Miss DeVoney is engrossed in the cheerful work of writing a book about how her father, Frank DeVoney of Greenock, came to assert his claim to discovering the creative secrets of those old Cremona masters.

There's something in the humble beginnings of the Greenock craftsman comparable to the flowering fame of the Yankee sculptor, Daniel Chester French, whose Lincoln Memorial is one of the glories of Washington. Louisa May Alcott started French off at the age of 7 with a sculptor's chisel, which he used right away to transform a turnip into a bullfrog.

STOOL BECAME VIOLIN

Only, when Frank DeVoney's father presented him with a woodcarver's chisel, the lad seized upon a kitchen stool and fashioned it into a violin.

For years, violinmakers had been constructing violins by measuring the thickness of the wood and without ever coming close to recapturing the superb sounds of the old Cremona craftsmen.

It was in the late 1870's, Miss DeVoney relates, that her father first heard the tone or sound that came away from the wood on the top and bottom plates of the violin on which he was experimenting.

Instead of measuring the thickness of the wood before the top and bottom plates were glued into place, DeVoney launched out along the lines of a study in physics he had completed in the classroom.

"Cramping" the back of the violin to his workbench, he bowed the edge of the wood firmly. What Bessie DeVoney's transcribed memoirs of her father show at this point is that Frank DeVoney right then heard "the sound" and that he cried out to the walls of the empty shop:

"They made them by sound!"

NO GUARANTEE

The "they" meant the violinmakers of Cremona—Stradivari, Amati, and the handful of others whose instruments are collectors' prizes today.

The family record taken down from father to daughter in Miss DeVoney's skilled shorthand shows how the Greenock "copyist" stumbled onto the secret of the old Italian masters' genius, namely the acoustical method of toning the wood itself in the violin during the course of construction.

Before then, textbooks on violinmaking were based largely on the theory that the Cremonans had made their instruments through their superior adeptness with the calipers in measuring the thickness of the wood. But what bothered latter-day violinmakers was that there was no guarantee, no scientific certainty, that the instruments made to exact measurements would be identical in tone.

DeVoney's claim to the recognition that followed his discovery was that it was vibration, not measurements, that produced stringed instruments with tones of glory in their airy varnished shells, instruments certain in tone and harmony.

LESSON IN PHYSICS

The schoolboy study which sparked his later discovery was a lesson in physics on "Chladni figures" dealing with the configuration of sound.

DeVoney's secret was broadcast through a series of articles he wrote for the newspaper in the People's Friend, published in Dundee. DeVoney was living in Blackpool at the time. He had turned out over a thousand violins prior to his discovery.

But now he was a busy "copyist" for the patrons who flocked to his shop in 63 Milburn Street in Blackpool, England.

Scanning the Dundee newspaper, his attention was drawn to the question-and-answer column in which a reader inquired how to make a good-toned violin.

The editor's answer in effect was: "Be careful with your measurements and trust to luck for good tone."

DeVoney wrote the editor that there was a surer way than trusting merely to calipers and luck. This led to the publishing of a series of three articles by Frank DeVoney in the People's Friend on "The Acoustics of Violin Making."

A patron of DeVoney's, after reading these articles, sent him three backs made by Vincent Panorma. DeVoney said that Panorma made by sound, as did also Lupot and Villeneuve.

"These three backs of Panorma's in all the 13 notes which I take," DeVoney told his daughter years later, "were identical one with the other, showing absolutely they were made by sound, since the density of the wood differs."

DeVoney tested Lupot's instruments, too; and in each of those examined, he found "the breasts had the identical notes of those made by Carlo Bergonzi."

Reminiscing in retirement here in California, DeVoney remarked to his notetaking daughter: "We know that Villeneuve worked by tone. He copied Guarneri's 'Joseph' to such a degree that Guarneri himself said: 'That is the one of my "Joseph".'"

DeVoney cited an anecdote circulated through a magazine article on "Making of Antiques" in which it was related that Villeneuve bought a Guarnerius and put his label in it.

"WOODEN SHOE" PLAYED

"But he could not mislead Paganini," DeVoney remarked, "because he was a skilled workman."

DeVoney recalled how Paganini made a violin out of a wooden shoe and played on it to a full house in Genoa, giving the proceeds to the chambermaid as a "dot" on her wedding eve.

It seems that "fiddle fights" were common sport in DeVoney's Blackpool workshop. The owner of a cherished Lupot or Strad or Bergonzi would post a player out of sight while he played first on the old master and then on the DeVoney.

A prominent Leeds collector by the name of Halton stacked his prized Carlo Bergonzi against a copy turned out at Blackpool inside of a week.

Upstairs in the DeVoney shop, Halton's violinist played the composition, Cavatina, on each instrument. He played DeVoney's first. When he was finished, Halton scooted upstairs and said, "The fine flowing tone of my Carlo was played first."

DETAILS RECOUNTED

Then, turning to DeVoney, the Leeds collector exclaimed warmly, "But, DeVoney, you have made a wonderfully fine second."

The details of this "fiddle fight" were recounted at the time in the London magazine, "Strings."

DeVoney was eager to share his secret with the world. That is why he was glad when William C. Honeyman asked him to write a chapter on "The Acoustics of Violin Making" for a book on the violin published in Edinburgh in 1893. Honeyman's book, "The Violin: How To Choose One," reached its seventh printing in 1951.

DeVoney was not a dreamer but a very practical man who could paint a picture or make a brass-railed fender for his fireside. He stressed how his studies were "true and certain." He even taught himself French to see if M. Savart mentioned how the plates were held when he got the notes during his experiments.

But no, Savart was silent. Perhaps Villeneuve knew, but if so, he wasn't telling. Otto, who wrote of the construction of the violin, may have known, but he only said that there was something more which he would not tell.

Could DeVoney produce the tone of Gasparo da Salo or Maggini? Honeyman was sure DeVoney had found the method for doing so.

LARGE, FREE TONE

It was Honeyman's opinion that the violins and cellos made by DeVoney bore out his statements, "for they are, though exceptionally thick in the plates, large and free in tone, equal on all strings, and just such instruments as a grand soloist will delight in when age has crowned and perfected the work of the maker."

The Edinburgh authority found that DeVoney's work as a copyist of famous masters had a quality "which I have never noted in such marked distinction in any new violin."

And Honeyman added: "Clearness and freedom of tone might be roughly set down as the quality to which I allude. A system built upon such a solid and scientific basis cannot fail to produce something like a revolution in violinmaking."

Of course, DeVoney thought so, too. "There can now be no hiding of a particular tone," DeVoney told Honeyman's readers, "for the best violins that can thus be constructed may now be taken to pieces, their exact notes recorded by the acute copyist and the same effect repeated by the humblest in the land."

DO IT YOURSELF

A 19th century "do it yourself" exponent of violin-making, DeVoney urged on Honeyman's readers: "Here, then, is a chance to distinguish yourselves, you violinmakers who love the labor and do not grudge thought and study and ceaseless experimenting."

Disavowing any inclination to "grasp the earth" or "keep any secret" or "lord it over anyone," DeVoney insisted "there is a way, a sure way—a fixed and scientific method—follow it and the world shall bless you and the result of your labors through all time. But, mark you, secrecy is now dead."

If DeVoney thought secrecy was out, perhaps he was overly optimistic. Instead, it was his chapter in Honeyman's book that was expunged after appearing in the first edition—his do-it-yourself instructions entitled, "The Acoustics of Violinmaking, and a Method in Which the Body and Character of the Tone of Any Violin May Be Accurately Copied."

In six subsequent printings, Frank DeVoney's chapter has been omitted—as recently as 1951.

NEGLECT BATTLED

It is not her closet full of fiddles and cellos by Blackpool's Frank DeVoney that concerns his daughter. But that neglect and obscurity has settled down over his genius and his generosity.

That is why this spunky little woman has patiently pursued a course in writing, and today is just as patiently pecking away on a book about her father's discovery. She wants the musical world to know and remember Frank DeVoney, especially, perhaps, in Blackpool where the blossom of his fleeting fame was blown.

Indeed, Miss DeVoney does not desire to sell her father's fiddles but to donate the instruments to Britain's National Youth Orchestra as well as the symphony orchestra of London, Edinburgh, and San Francisco as enduring and useful mementos of her father's work.

NO SALE

"A consignment of violins by Stradivarius, sent to London to be sold at the modest price of £8 each, were returned as unsalable. This seems astonishing to us, but it must be remembered that these violins were new, and a Strad with the red varnish whole has rather a vulgar look, and could not be distinguished a few yards off from a cheap French fiddle, while the players that looked at them had the choice of old English and old German violins by the score, and the love of the subtle sweetness of the Italian tone had yet to be created. By the time that education had been accomplished, the violins of Stradivarius had also improved and matured and grown picturesque in appearance with wear, and so found a ready sale." [From: "The Violin: How To Choose One" by William C. Honeyman, Edinburgh: E. Kohler & Son, 1893.]

A 'FIDDLE FIGHT'

(By a Staff Correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

Dr. C. W. Conger of Indianapolis owned a DeVoney violin and being in a position to do so, frequently challenged all comers to beat his violin for tone.

The following letter relates the results of such a contest:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., July 7, 1920.

C. R. KEITH.

DEAR SIR: We had another fiddle fight at the Circle Theater. The principal judge Ernest Schmidt. He is the conductor of the orchestra (about 30 pieces) and has a truly wonderful ear—positive pitch, absolute tone memory, and thorough training in music. Young, Bally, and Fry, all good judges, besides several violinists.

Schmidt's judgment was as follows:

1. DeVoney.
2. Guarnerius.
3. France Gobeth.
4. Ellis.
5. Bergonzi (Carlos).
6. The joke fiddle I told you of.

My decision was the same on the first three. I made Bergonzi fourth and Ellis last.

Bally made DeVoney first, Gobeth second. Young made Guarnerius first and Gobeth second and DeVoney third.

Fry made Gobeth first and DeVoney second.

The player gave DeVoney first.

So you see DeVoney must be a good fiddle. I left it with the first violinist of the orchestra and heard it again last night with crowded house, and it comes through like two fiddles all the time. If you have a fiddle to beat it, send it on and try it against the Guarnerius, Gobeth, DeVoney, and Bergonzi (genuine). If you beat them you have something. These trials are fair, player in the dark, big theater, and then orchestra trial beside.

I thought the Guarnerius would certainly beat DeVoney, but no. Different tone entirely, the G bigger, but a roughness. Like a new violin under the chin. Bergonzi is harsh and loud.

I have not heard from DeVoney for some time. Hope he is well.

Yours respectfully and hastily,

C. W. CONGER.

Russian Plans for Gas Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted an important article in the magazine Quest, entitled "Russia's Plans for Gas Warfare." This timely and interesting study is of particular importance at a time when we are giving a new look to the adequacy of our civil defense program. I wish to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA PLANS FOR GAS WARFARE

(By David Pursglove)

(The Soviet Union plans to turn any world war III into a "CBR" war, intelligence sources are convinced. And the Reds are far better prepared than we are to withstand chemical, biological, and radiological warfare—with its canisters of tularemia and cholera, its sprays of radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors, its bombs containing nerve gases, and the old standby, mustard gas.)

Officials feel these conclusions are inescapable, since what we know of Russian offensive CBR capabilities is confirmed by the extent of their defenses. Indeed, ever since warfare began, an intelligence officer's best indication of enemy intent has been a look at how the enemy is prepared to defend himself. And the Soviet Union is far better prepared than we.

The average Russian knows as much about protecting himself from CBR attack as he knows about his job. Hundreds of thousands of Russians have especially developed civilian gas masks hanging in their homes or stored handily in office desk drawers. All other Russians know where to turn at any moment to get a government-issued emergency mask from the stocks in their offices, factories, or apartment houses.

Every new building in Russia—office, apartment, or home—has to be built over a civil-defense-approved fallout shelter. All over the vast expanse of the Soviet Union are civil defense stores that sell radiation dosimeters, gas masks, anti-poison-gas kits, and rubber clothing for protection against fallout. And the people know how to use this equipment. Almost every Russian adult and teenager has been through an intensive, compulsory 22-hour civil defense course. Millions have had another three or four courses averaging 10 hours each, and now they are required to pass a new 12-hour course.

Since the Soviet revolution, and especially since their recognition of military airpower in 1931, the Russians have been learning how to organize their massive civilian population into a defense organization as effective as a well-run army. Two major organizations spearhead this program.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD)—once synonymous with the dreaded secret police, and still responsible for regular police and the labor camps—is in overall charge of civilian defense. Many MVD and regular army troops are slated for civil defense operations in wartime. However, the MVD normally runs its home front defense program through public officials.

Each city's administration chart has a dual character. Every official has his normal function and also has a civil defense assignment. These are not static roles. MVD maintains a small corps of civil defense specialists in every city. In war, they will supervise city officials in their defense tasks; in peace, they constantly inspect civil defense readiness, test the results of intensive population training and approve or reject with an eye on civil

defense all plans for new streets, subways, parks, buildings and factories.

Closely cooperating with the MVD is the organization that actually conducts training and distributes materials and equipment—the Volunteer Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Fleet (DOSAAF). For 30 years, DOSAAF has conducted courses in marksmanship, skiing, first aid, flying, parachuting, gliding, chemical and air defense. Now anti-CBR defense is stressed through its thousands of units in cities, collective farms, universities and factories in the Soviet Union. DOSAAF has military instructors teaching courses sponsored by the armed forces. There are also civilian instructors who vie with the military in teaching civil defense courses where it is a crime to be a poor or lax teacher.

In the past 2 years, almost every Russian adult has been enrolled in a compulsory civil defense course being taught by 40,000 specially trained DOSAAF instructors. Not only does the course require knowledge, for instance, of how to use a gas mask, but it also demands that the citizen understand gas mask design so he can improvise his own in an emergency. For a solid hour, instructors chosen for what we Americans would call blood-thirstiness, hammer at the newest methods of warfare and what they mean to civilians in terms of blast wave destruction, fireball effect, radiation burn, chemical toxicity and infectious diseases. Most of this arouses interest and gives the citizen a reason to remain alert and absorb the instruction. (There is also another, probably more effective, reason: if he fails, he has to repeat the course.) Another hour is devoted to designing air filters for shelters. Two hours are spent on the theory of protecting food and water from contamination and radioactive fallout.

It is not all theory and classroom work that make up the 12-hour course. There is plenty of practice. After an instructor describes the reasons for skimming surface snow from chosen paths in fallout areas, the students, men and women alike, go outside and shovel snow until the instructor or MVD inspector is satisfied that they are doing it properly. And woe unto the student who fails to understand his gas mask lecture, for as soon as the gas warfare test chamber in city or collective farm is available to his class, he must depend on his mask for protection as he first sits, and then exercises, in an atmosphere of war gas. The gas is usually chloropicrin—actually used in World War I combat. It is a strong, sometimes dangerous, type of tear gas.

For most Russians, however, this is just a refresher course with some new material added. We now know that between 1956 and 1959, most of the population took a similar 22-hour course. And in 1955-56, 110 million Russians—85.5 percent of the civilians between ages 16 and 60—passed a 10-hour course in atomic warfare defense.

DOSAAF keeps local units well supplied with training materials. There are always masks, dosimeters, at least three types of fire extinguishers, first aid equipment, chemical warfare protection and detection kits, and all kinds of tools. There is also a wide assortment of well-written, profusely illustrated training manuals and civil defense pamphlets. DOSAAF units and the MVD supply a constantly changing set of civil defense posters to factory superintendents and building managers who are required to display them. These are not just slogan posters—many of them are enlarged reproductions of pages from instruction manuals. Attention-getting color is widely used in posters and books produced by DOSAAF's own huge publishing house.

Some classes taking advanced training for coveted civil defense badges are called out in the middle of the night on "chemical alerts" and march as much as 10 miles, up to 2 miles while wearing their masks. Others are called out to ski 15 miles, 3 miles with

masks on—and always at night, so not to interfere with regular work.

The Russian civilian gas mask is readily available in civil defense stores operated by DOSAAF. However, it costs \$10 to \$14—a week's wages for some Russians—and only a few hundred thousand civilians own the masks. The rest of the population trains with masks furnished by DOSAAF. There are mask caches in many office and apartment buildings and factories.

The civilian gas mask is credited as "very good" by U.S. Army chemical warfare authorities. Unlike most masks, it gives full face protection and covers the chin. It is not as compact as new U.S. masks which use cheek pad filters instead of canisters. However, it is used with the canister kept inside the tightly-woven carrying bag which acts as an additional filter against contaminated or radioactive dust particles.

DOSAAF stores also stock, at very low prices, the gauze, cotton and instructions for making emergency masks to protect against breathing radioactive dust. There is a wide line of rubber and rubberized clothing—hats, ponchos, trousers, and boots—to ward off liquid chemicals and fallout dust. Citizens are urged to purchase radiation dosimeters. Two models are stocked: film badges and pencil types. Dosimeters or contamination meters for large areas are distributed to buildings and factories by DOSAAF and to city officials by the MVD.

Not long after intelligence officers started seeing Russian civil defense training manuals and posters, they started getting other pieces of more specific information. They began learning the exact nature of some Soviet work. Take, for example, an atropine Syrette issued to all troops as protection against deadly nerve gases. It looked very much like the one developed for our own troops.

This and other incidents helped to confirm that Russia and the United States probably have been working along similar lines.

Neither nation has a monopoly on knowledge. Said one intelligence officer: "The more I see in this area, the more it proves to me that everybody has the same base level of learning."

There are differences, but they are primarily of degree or emphasis. The Russians are far ahead of us in developing a mass inoculation technique to treat populations exposed to CBR agents. We lead in a program to develop antiradiation drugs as preventive medicine for troops about to enter a radiological warfare zone.

The Russian mass immunization technique uses vaccines in aerosol form—by generating a fine mist of active ingredients. Soviet Army medical specialists seem to feel that their spray generators are fully developed, and that they know enough about the effects of a number of agents in aerosol form to put the technique to use. The U.S. Army Medical Service is approaching the "aerogenic technique" very cautiously. Vaccines that behave one way when injected hypodermically sometimes behave quite differently when tried as aerosols. This is especially true of vaccines that should not contact the respiratory system. Officers believe that some life-saving vaccines can actually produce pneumonia when they are administered in the aerosol form.

We still are working with lower animals in developing our own aerosol vaccine technique. The aerosol generator, which one officer says will be "a very expensive piece of gadgetry," presents the least problems. The physiology is another matter. How does dissemination as an aerosol affect the size of the needed dose? How often should it be administered? What are the differences between walking and running through an aerosol-filled room? What happens if a person, such as a crippled person, stays too

long? Until these questions are answered, the Army Medical Service will rely on its rapid, multi-shot, high-pressure spray hypodermic.

Another area where both nations have worked independently but along similar lines, is in antiradiation drugs. Medical officers of both armies are pursuing programs built around mercaptans. These sulfur-containing compounds are highly effective in reducing radiation sickness. However, their toxicity is as great a curse as the radiation sickness that they prevent.

Our program has reached the point of testing small doses of several compounds on men. Army Medical Service officers are confident that an acceptable prophylaxis should be ready for wide testing within perhaps 2 years. If it is the logical outgrowth of the present program, it will require advance warning of radiological attack since it will be effective only if administered several hours before exposure.

The Russians, as well as their satellite allies, are also working on mercaptans. However, even the most likely looking Russian developments have been tested only on rodents, dogs, and monkeys, as far as U.S. officers can learn.

In both nations, the antiradiation drug programs rely heavily on outside research and industrial laboratories for clues to further advances. In Russia there is no problem. All research results in any field are reported routinely to the Minister of Defense. There is no separation between the chemical industry and the State. The Government readily gets what it needs.

In the United States, the situation is much different. The Army Medical Service has to make its problems and needs known to industry and to independent research laboratories, persuade them to cooperate, and convince them that proprietary information will be carefully guarded. All of this must be done on a very small budget.

The Army Medical Service right now limits its requests for information to the field of sulfur chemistry. The much larger industry contact program of the Army Chemical Corps—which seeks information in all fields—perhaps provides a better understanding of how these programs work.

Over 500 of the Nation's 3,000 R. & D. laboratories already participate in a liaison program sponsored by the Army Chemical Corps. Hopefully, more laboratories will join in participating, so that the Army can keep up with the snowballing information it needs in chemistry, metallurgy, medicine, electronics, and the many other fields that contribute to modern chemical-biological-radiological warfare.

Many of these will be the key the Army needs to new incapacitating agents, more effective smoke pots, better flamethrower gaskets or faster poison gas detection systems. Industrial research people in all fields last year reported to the Army several thousand developments and discoveries. Some of these were the intentional results of their research, some were accidental. Often it is the accidental that has proved more promising.

Mustard gas, for example, was known for 50 years before its value as a weapon was recognized in 1917. Its effectiveness probably was first recognized as a result of an accidental spill on H. T. Clarke when he was working in Emil Fischer's Laboratory in 1911 and 1912. Tabun and Sarin—the nerve gases or "G-agents"—were discovered by Schrader in Germany, while he was searching for new insecticides.

An Army Chemical Center spokesman credits the liaison program with the information responsible for a great percentage of the new incapacitating agents that recently have fascinated newspaper readers. These are agents that put a soldier out of action without killing him. They do it by making

him overly nervous, or too relaxed, or extremely sensitive to slight temperature changes. Or, they make him laugh himself out of action. Or, they might make him love his enemy, or cause him to vomit so much that he is incapable of fighting.

The Chemical Corps has carried out projects to bring ideas into practical shape for use as weapons. Officials still hope that they never will be used. But only a fool would be without them if his enemy has them.

The whole question of whether CBR warfare should be discussed in public draws the charge, more often than not, that the Pentagon is trying to get a larger budget. This might have been true several years ago when the Chemical Corps had to beg for funds to conduct work. The budget, however, has grown, and, over a year ago, Army Research and Development Director Richard S. Morse, publicly stated that there was enough money for CBR:

"We don't need any more. In fiscal year 1960 we spent \$40 million, and this has been expanded. The fiscal 1961 and 1962 budgets are going up, not in a crash program but at an orderly rate."

Despite greater spending, CBR warfare is still kept out of public Pentagon conversation. (A few generals have admitted it into their vocabularies, but with the prefix, defense against.) Too, the State Department now limits its control over the Pentagon's public discussions to the censorship of any references to offensive use of the weapons by the United States.

But perhaps the best indication that the ostrich has uncovered its head is that references to CBR developments by Government officials, which used to draw indignant charges of amateurish statesmanship, an unforgivable slip, or worse from the British Embassy, now bring little more than raised eyebrows.

Even with the relatively free discussions of CBR warfare these days, few details are made public on exactly which war gases we know the Russians are stockpiling, or which type of germ warfare they are ready to unleash. For such discussions tell the Russians more about us than we are telling our people about the Russians. For each bit of information that is printed in the United States tells the Red about a different facet of our intelligence operations—and about the leaks in their own security.

It gains us nothing to describe in detail what we know of their offensive plans; but rest assured, we do know what they are doing, and we know that it is not very different from what we are doing. Neither nation has a monopoly.

The Russians, of course, know that we are familiar with their CBR defense plans. After all, they have been drilled into the minds of a hundred million of their citizens.

But the question of their defenses brings up the question of ours. And here the Russians obviously are aware of the evaluation of our efforts made by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences:

1. In our limited program, much information and resources are not used properly.

2. The secrecy surrounding many civil defense activities results in withholding some information that citizens need for realistic planning.

3. Civil defense in America will remain ineffective as long as it holds an assigned status lower than military defense.

Basically, the United States has not been able to stimulate enough interest in civil defense. Even where special anti-CBR equipment has been developed—and we have a good, low-cost civilian protective mask, for example—there is not enough interest to warrant mass production and distribution.

Some Russian citizens do not like to give up free time to civil defense instruction any more than Americans would. However, centuries of war, two generations of civil de-

fense, and a controlled press and radio have made most Russians not only receptive, but eager. A Stanford Research Institute expert who specializes in Russian civil and military defense points to another important factor:

"Russians always have had a lower standard of living and more government regimentation than U.S. citizens. By comparison, the Russian has to give up far less to achieve adequate civil defense. Now the area to watch is Communist China—the Chinese will have to give up virtually nothing to develop a civil defense more effective even than Russia's."

What does this difference between free world and Communist civil defense mean to the average citizen in the cold war? Herman Kahn, Rand Corp. specialist on Russian defenses, makes it very clear:

"There is an enormous difference in the bargaining ability of a country which can put its people in safety on 24 hours' notice and one which cannot. If this is hard to visualize, imagine that the Russians had done exactly that, and we had not. Then, ask yourself how you think we would come out at a subsequent bargaining table."

CBR WARFARE—SOME DEFINITIONS

The phrase "CBR warfare" is an abbreviated way of referring to chemical, biological, and radiological warfare. When a military man refers to chemical warfare, he means the intentional employment of toxic gases, liquids, or solids, to produce casualties, and the use of screening smoke or incendiaries. Biological warfare is the military use of living organisms or their toxic products to cause death, disability, or damage to man, his domestic animals, or crops. Radiological warfare employs the harmful ionizing effects of radiation against man, whether directly or indirectly.

Poison gas was proposed for use against the Russians in the Crimean War, and in our Civil War against the Confederate Army, but neither suggestion was put to the test. Tear gases were used for harassment purposes by the French in August 1914. The first significant gas attack was the German use of chlorine on April 22, 1915, against the British and French at Ypres. The British retaliated in kind 6 months later at Loos. The next major step was the German introduction of phosgene, a choking gas which could penetrate the crude gas masks then in existence. The Germans introduced mustard gas in July 1917. This blistering agent could produce casualties even among men wearing masks. Another family of toxic gases was introduced by the French and the Austrians in 1918—the blood gases. The first American use of gas was in June 1918, when phosgene was used against the Germans.

Prohibition of gas warfare was agreed to by a number of countries at The Hague in 1899. Neither the United States nor Great Britain signed this treaty. Since the treaty banned use of gas-filled projectiles, French use of tear gas rifle grenades in 1914, and German use of stationary pressurized chlorine gas tanks for the first attack made it a moot point as to whether or how any treaty obligations had been violated. In 1925 a treaty at the Geneva Conference called not only for prohibition of war gases but also bacteriological warfare. In ratifying the treaty, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., and some other nations made it clear they were bound only in relation to other countries complying with the treaty terms. The United States, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, and Brazil did not sign the treaty.

Biological warfare also goes far back in history. Poisoning of wells was an old trick. In the 14th century, the Tartars besieging the Italians in a fortress in Crimea threw over the wall the bodies of plague victims. By the 16th century, an Italian tactical manual described how to construct artillery

shells for delivery of disease to the enemy. In our own colonial days, it is reported that European traders passed out blankets used by smallpox victims to Indians so as to reduce their fighting strength. There is definite evidence that in more recent times German agents in this country inoculated animals being shipped to Europe, so that diseases would be carried there.

Limited biological warfare may have been tested by Japan in China during World War II.

Radiological warfare was not a serious possibility until the perfection of the atomic bomb in 1945. The initial burst of radioactivity from the bomb and fireball is not classed as radiological warfare, only the succeeding radioactive fallout. This definition may have to be modified if a new nuclear weapon designed primarily to produce neutrons is developed. The bombs burst over Japan were not radiological weapons.

Radiological warfare calls for bombing or spraying areas with radioactive materials. These can be isotopes created for RW; they can be the packaged waste products of nuclear reactors.

United Nations, Supported Mainly by U.S. Dollars, Gives Propaganda Forum to Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how long are the American people going to stand for paying most of the bills of the United Nations so that bloodthirsty dictators like Fidel Castro, and power-mad despots like Khrushchev can use it as a forum to turn world opinion against us? I, for one, think we should reexamine our participation in the United Nations and if it cannot function as it is intended to according to its charter, as an organization for peaceful nations, we may have to alter our position regarding it. It is sickening to read such news stories as the following one from the New York Times, in which we are castigated by Cuban representatives, speaking words originated in Moscow as a part of the ultimate Communist goal, the destruction of the United States:

CUBA, IN U.N., SCORES UNITED STATES ON GUANTANAMO

(By Henry Giniger)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 24.—Cuba challenged today the right of the United States to retain the naval base at Guantanamo Bay under its treaty with Cuba. The United States countered with a charge of "international lawlessness."

In a vehement speech before a special session of the General Assembly, Mario Garcia-Inchaustegui, chief Cuban delegate to the United Nations, attacked the validity of the treaty, first signed in 1903.

The session began Monday primarily to discuss the French-Tunisian dispute over Bizerte. But the debate, scheduled to end late tomorrow night, has unleashed a flood of rancor and an airing of grievances on the part of small nations that were once under some kind of control or domination by larger powers.

The small nations' outpourings have been

abetted by the Soviet bloc, which has mounted a continuous attack on the worldwide system of foreign bases retained from the past or newly negotiated by the West.

While the Soviet delegate sat beaming, the delegates of Cuba and Guinea, a former French territory in Africa, called for the end of all foreign bases, negotiated or not, on the ground that none of the countries harboring such bases could be truly independent.

BYELORUSSIA SPEAKS UP

The Soviet bloc's contribution to the discussion today came from Byelorussia, a Soviet Republic, which declared its "selfless support to the fighters for independence."

After denouncing French resistance to evacuating their naval base in Bizerte, senior Garcia-Inchaustegui brought up the Guantanamo Bay Base, which he implied was Cuba's Bizerte. He said treaties could not be used to justify foreign bases.

"Neither under law nor under international morality can any validity or value be given to documents signed for the purpose of diminishing the sovereignty of states," he asserted. "To bind themselves internationally, states must be sovereign, and they cannot in fact be sovereign if they are forced to admit foreign military forces into their territory."

Senior Garcia-Inchaustegui went on to charge that the Guantanamo base existed not for U.S. defense "but against Cuba and to combat the struggle of Latin-American peoples for liberation." He declared that "at this very moment mercenaries are being concentrated at Guantanamo and in Puerto Rico to be used later against small independent states."

STEVENSON REPLIES

Several hours later, shortly before the close of the session just prior to 6 p.m., Adlai E. Stevenson, chief U.S. delegate, rose to call the Cuban's challenge to the Guantanamo treaty "an extraordinary new doctrine of international law, or rather of international lawlessness."

Mr. Stevenson declared it to be "a normal exercise of sovereignty" for states to conclude defense agreements. He charged that the Cuban representatives had "denied the principles of mutual trust and respect for the pledged word on which progress toward international law and order has been and must be based."

The U.S. delegate labeled as "false and absurd" the accusation that the base was directed against Cuba or other countries. The history of this century, he declared, has shown that the base has been maintained to defend the hemisphere, not attack it.

The United States-Cuban treaty was renewed in 1934. The treaty stipulates that it can be changed only by the mutual consent of the two parties to it. In the present state of relations between the two countries, Washington has signified that it has no intention of consenting to a change.

Mr. Stevenson's skirmish with the Cuban delegate was one of three that developed in the Assembly today. None of them had anything directly to do with the Bizerte issue.

Tunisia called for a special session as a means of rallying world opinion against France to force her to agree to the principle of evacuating the Bizerte base. The crisis erupted July 19 when France used force to defend her positions in Bizerte against Tunisian demonstrators.

For the fourth day in a row, France boycotted the session on the ground that the dispute was solely one for her and Tunisia to settle. Her refusal to argue her case here has added to the animosity of countries hostile to her. Those allied or friendly with her have also been critical of her attitude.

Tunisia's appeal to all nations to forget their relations with France and the East-West split in the world and concentrate on the merits of the case itself has gone un-

headed on all sides since the debate began. Today's session furnished the best example of this.

UNITED STATES CHALLENGES SOVIET

After answering Cuba, Mr. Stevenson turned to the Soviet delegation. He challenged Moscow to give the same kind of self-determination to East Germany that the United States has given Puerto Rico. He issued challenge because the Cuban delegate had called Puerto Rico a U.S. colony on which were situated 10 military bases.

Platon D. Morozov, the Soviet delegate, retorted by calling the Puerto Rican regime one of "oppression and enslavement." He repeated his charges that the United States was evading any support for Tunisia because of its friendship for France.

The third skirmish was among Africans. Guinea, which broke from France in 1958 under bitter circumstances, called on all African states to sever their ties with former imperial powers that infringed on their sovereignty.

Telli Diallo, Guinea's spokesman, pointed in particular to military pacts that had been signed by African members of the French Community with France. He called the pacts "pseudo-agreements" that "are a constant threat to our recently acquired sovereignty."

FHA-Type Home-Purchasing Plan Can Aid Latin Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an important editorial on FHA-type home purchasing in its application to Latin nations. I am completely in accord with the program which is outlined in this editorial and I have urged its adoption. It appeared in the Pensacola, Florida, News.

FHA-TYPE HOME PURCHASING PLAN CAN AID LATIN NATIONS

At this time when the United States is proposing so much financial assistance for Latin American nations to improve the status of the underprivileged, it is doubtful if any move would have greater effect than proposals now studied to put decent homes within reach of most residents.

That is the objective of a measure sponsored by Florida's Senator SMATHERS which passed the Senate last week. It is designed to provide FHA-type financing of home purchases in Latin America for low income classes. The ultimate effect should be to encourage greater American investments in those nations for that purpose.

The resolution would earmark \$25 million of the \$100 million Development Loan Fund to guarantee American private investments in home financing in the undeveloped nations. Since the funds also would be guaranteed by the government of the nation involved the risks to the American Government and to the private investors would be reduced to a desirable level.

In this country low interest FHA home financing plans are accepted as a matter of course and millions of homeowners have been created as a result. But conditions in most Latin nations are quite different. In Mexico, for example, a down payment of 50 percent is customary, with interest rates ranging from 12 to 24 percent. Also few home

mortgages are issued for more than 5 years. The result is that almost no low income families are ever in position to buy. They remain tenants with almost no hope of bettering their status.

Introduction and encouragement by the United States of such programs would show the rank and file residents of these nations how American democracy really aids the little man. It should be one of the strongest means of combatting communism in the area where the Reds are making their strongest gains. We must never forget that the man who owns or is buying his home is a stable citizen who will be most reluctant to risk its loss in return for vague promises from Communist agitators.

New Haven (Mo.) Leader Comments on the "Disturbing" Fiscal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I noted the New Haven (Mo.) Leader's article of August 3 which delved into the vitally important question of the Government's fiscal situation. The article, written by James W. Douthat, quite properly labels the situation as "disturbing" and makes the point that added defense spending makes it "all the more imperative to trim nondefense expenditures to the maximum extent possible." Mr. Douthat and the New Haven Leader make a clear and important point, and I should like to insert the article by Mr. Douthat at this point in the RECORD.

PROGRESS ACCOMPLISHED WITH FISCAL SANITY: REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS

(By James W. Douthat)

The Government's fiscal condition can only be described as disturbing.

Spending is soaring for many welfare projects in addition to national defense.

The deficit for the 1961 fiscal year (which ended on June 30) was a startling \$3,900 million—and all indications point to a much larger one for the current fiscal year.

No one objects to whatever spending is actually necessary for defense—but everyone has a right to insist that all possible waste in military expenditures be eliminated.

And if it is essential to increase military spending, this makes it all the more imperative to trim nondefense expenditures to the maximum extent possible.

As Representative CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, said a few days ago: "In evaluating urgent national needs the administration must recognize that the only economic progress that will mean anything to the American people is progress accomplished within the framework of fiscal sanity."

The accelerated rate of spending since Mr. Kennedy entered the White House is shown by the fact that the budget submitted by President Eisenhower estimated expenditures for the 1961 fiscal year at \$78,900 million—whereas they actually jumped to \$81,500 million, a gain of \$2,600 million.

President Eisenhower estimated receipts at \$79 billion—whereas the actual figure was \$77,600 million, a drop of \$1,400 million.

There are many who think that the Kennedy policies served to retard business re-

covery and thereby diminished the amount of tax revenue.

Be that as it may, the \$80 million surplus forecast by Mr. Eisenhower turned into a \$8,900 million deficit under Mr. Kennedy.

The speed with which the deficit mounted is shown by the fact that on March 28—less than 4 months before the final figures were announced—the Kennedy administration had forecast a \$2,200 million deficit, and on June 20—exactly 1 month before the final announcement—Secretary of the Treasury Dillon had predicted that the deficit "will approach \$3 billion."

As for the present fiscal year, the official forecast before Mr. Kennedy's defense recommendations to Congress called for a \$3,700 million deficit.

But there was no doubt, even before Mr. Kennedy's new recommendations, that the deficit would be considerably higher unless the voters waged a determined campaign against unnecessary spending.

Senator BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, a leading economy advocate for many years, told the Senate recently:

"Existing Federal spending programs, along with those currently under consideration, would increase Federal spending to more than \$100 billion a year within the foreseeable future."

COALITION STILL VIGOROUS

Proof that the southern Democratic-northern Republican coalition can still be effective was provided by the House vote which killed President Kennedy's plan to reorganize the procedure of the National Labor Relations Board.

Because of some recent Kennedy victories in Congress—a big percentage of them by close votes—the liberals had sought to create the impression that the coalition was dead and that the President's will was sure to prevail on most things.

The vote against Mr. Kennedy on the NLRB proposal was 231 to 179—with 78 Democrats joining 153 Republicans in opposition. Twelve Republicans joined 167 Democrats in support of the President.

Day Wins Employee Raves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I think that Mary McGrory, of the Evening Star, has done a fine story about Postmaster General J. Edward Day, which appeared in the August 23 issue of that paper.

The Honorable J. Edward Day is doing a great job as Postmaster General of the United States and accomplishing it without hullabaloo and fanfare of trumpets which is quite refreshing from the attitude and position taken by his immediate predecessor.

Mr. Day is an outstanding administrator as is proven by the fact that in choosing his assistants he did so on the basis of their knowledge and experience rather than for any other reason. Those of us who have had an intimate relationship with the Post Office and Civil Service Committees on both sides of the House know the sterling worth of Bill Brawley and Fred Belen. Here are two of the most knowledgeable people in

Washington on subjects dealing with the Post Office. It was refreshing to see them chosen to assist Postmaster General Day in leading a vital Department in our Federal Government.

In the few months Mr. Brawley has served as J. Edward Day's Deputy and Mr. Belen as Assistant Postmaster General in charge of the Bureau of Operations. The wisdom of his selection has been clearly demonstrated.

I am pleased to insert Mary McGrory's excellent article on the Postmaster General:

AFTER 6 MONTHS—DAY WINS EMPLOYEE RAVES
(By Mary McGrory)

J. Edward Day, the crisp and sunny Postmaster General of the United States, pursues a course on the New Frontier that is as solitary and simple as that of a rural letter carrier.

Unlike those who must ponder the effect of a decision of a touchy new African republic or sulky soybean growers, he has but a single concern: The improvement of the mail service.

He sees the President about twice a month. The President mentioned the importance of the postal-rate increase, now pending before Congress, in his Berlin crisis speech; but the mechanics of seeing that the postmen make their appointed rounds, he leaves to Mr. Day, a former life-insurance executive.

Mr. Day is the only cabinet officer who is rereading "Wuthering Heights" these days and writing a novel of his own. He is the only one who is not addicted to the 14-hour working day and who claims to lead a normal family life. He finds he can do his work in the hours between 8:45 in the morning and six at night.

"I used to work in a law firm where the caste symbol was the bulging briefcase carried home at night. I used to think if they were carrying a live mouse in it, it would be dead by morning. I never carried a briefcase," he remarked jovially.

If he differs from his fellows in the cabinet, Mr. Day also differs from his predecessors, mainly portly chaps who also were chairmen of their national committees. Mr. Day, lean of countenance and figure, has no party responsibilities at all. He has failed to get this message across.

"A lot of my time is wasted by a lot of people, who ought to know better, asking me to get them jobs as Federal marshals or regional attorneys for the Labor Department. They just don't believe I can't do it."

QUARTERS ARE AMPLE

Mr. Day's office is the largest of any Cabinet officer's. It is paneled in wood, and of a grandeur to satisfy General de Gaulle. He works about half a mile from the door at a clear desk with a clear mind.

Across from his quarters is another baronial hall, where one of his most famous predecessors, James A. Farley, used to make his way among the leather armchairs, patting the shoulders of politicians and inquiring for their Aunt Mames.

Mr. Day hasn't figured out a use for the room, while acknowledging its usefulness to inspire awe in the petitioner.

His only constituents besides the letter-writers of the Nation, who are so far unorganized, are the 580,000 employees of the Postoffice Department, most of whom are clustered in 15 Federal postal unions.

After 6 months of his "open door" policy he is drawing rave notices. William Doherty, the head of the Letter Carriers Union, said recently in a Dayton speech: "For the first time in many, many years, we are able to work with the Department as partners instead of having to cool our heels in unfriendly anterooms waiting for a few crumbs of comfort to fall from the tables of the mighty."

TREND REVERSER

Mr. Doherty is the author of a book called "Mallman, U.S.A.," which devotes several searing chapters to the previous Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, who he suggests enjoyed as much love and affection from the postal workers as Ezra Taft Benson got from the farmers.

Mr. Day has concentrated in his first 6 months on building up friendliness, warmth, and enthusiasm in the department in reversing certain trends started by the publicity-conscious Mr. Summerfield.

"There was too much ballyhoo about post-office equipment and automation and too many announcements about sending mail by rocket and coaxial cables."

Mr. Day also insisted on putting in his own men as the 15 regional directors of the postal system. He confers with them by network conference telephone every Wednesday afternoon. He recently completed a 40,000-mile tour of 40 major postoffices, where he put to the employees such pertinent questions as whether they liked to pace a mail-sorting machine or preferred to have it pace them. He tried to discourage everybody from calling him general.

Mr. Day has made considerable impression on Capitol Hill as a witness, a role well-suited to one with his appetite for comparative statistics. But he has fared less well as an advocate. His postal rate increase bill is about as popular as the 5-year term foreign aid program and Chairman JOHNSTON of South Carolina of the Senate Postoffice Committee has set his face against it.

"I have differences with Mr. JOHNSTON, but no antagonisms," said Mr. Day.

Mr. Day's introduction of the merit system, whereby men from within the ranks are promoted to supervisory posts on recommendation of a selection board has rendered him something less than a hero with patronage hungry Congressmen. He is quite stoical about their compalints. He warned every one at the beginning that he would run the postoffice.

HAS ANSWER FOR HECKLERS

He does not appreciate hecklers who point out the superior glories of the European mail system, which still has two deliveries a day.

"The New York City Post Office handles more mail in a day than the entire British Postal System," he says firmly. "And the New York City Post Office hasn't had a new building in 30 years."

Why Does U.S. Rail Equipment, Synthetic Rubber, and Chemicals Go Behind the Iron Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when it is realized that there are millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who hope for the day when they can be freed from communistic dictatorship, it seems logical to encourage them in every possible way to take whatever action is in their power to speed that day. Under certain circumstances and by certain means it might be well to utilize ways and means to keep them alive and healthy, so long as they know it is help to them, from freemen who want to share with them their freedom. This takes a skillful bit of doing. But it is

not an impossibility. At the same time, the quickest way to dash forever the hopes of these people and eliminate their considerable power for the cause of ridding the world of communism, is to indulge in activities of help to the Communist dictatorship.

In this frame of reference, the Kennedy administration has a lot of explaining left to do relative to its trade policies with Communist countries. If it cannot come up with satisfactory explanations, and I doubt that it can, these policies should be swiftly revised.

The following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram succinctly reiterates this caution:

TRADE WITH THE ENEMY?

President Kennedy has decided that it wouldn't look very nice to open aerial commerce between New York and Moscow at a time when the Soviets are busy sealing off East Berlin from the West.

The agreement to open up a New York-Moscow airline will go unsigned for the time being "because of the tense international situation."

This is a significant but comparatively mild sanction. If the United States really wants to show its displeasure with Soviet conduct, the commerce already taking place offers the opportunity.

This country sends a constant flow of goods into Communist lands, and if material presently licensed for shipping is actually shipped, the flow will increase enormously.

In the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's hard-hitting speech outlining the Berlin crisis and stressing the sacrifices required to meet the crisis, the volume of American goods licensed for shipment to countries behind the Iron Curtain increased more than 800 percent.

Goods which helped account for the increase included: rail equipment for Bulgaria; synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; industrial instruments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany.

Theoretically, American export regulations prevent shipping to the Soviet bloc materials which would increase the ability of the Reds to wage war.

Is anybody so stupid as to believe that rail equipment, synthetic rubber, and industrial chemicals have no bearing, directly or indirectly, on the warming potential of the Soviet bloc?

Secretary of Commerce Hodges said in an interview on August 3:

"I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 or 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

We believe he has assessed the American temper accurately. Many Americans are beginning to wonder whether it makes sense to increase the strength of the power which threatens their own survival.

There Is Danger in a Faulty Analysis of Power of Communist-Dominated People To Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the danger we face in the United States by the

wrong analysis of communism and its many facets, is made too clear in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune. It is seldom I disagree with the editorial content of the Tribune because I have found the editorial writers on this newspaper to be fairly sound in their judgment. However, I do disagree in this instance, and because I believe it is important to make a point, I include the editorial and my reasons for disagreement as a part of the RECORD.

It is wishful thinking to embrace the idea that maybe the East Germans will revolt if the Communists are successful in their present efforts to tighten the bonds of slavery in that area and that such revolt will spread to other Communist-controlled nations. History proves such a theory is a fallacy. People under Communist control cannot revolt because, unlike the French in Algeria—which the editorial points up—the Russian Communists are absolutely ruthless in suppressing any opposition. Having no moral code, the Communists place no value on human lives and meet any opposition by the complete elimination of those who rise up. Witness the brutal and ruthless extermination of the people of Hungary, the many programs and blood baths in Russia itself. Once the Communists have complete control the chance for revolution is past because it will be suppressed even if it means wiping out a whole people.

The only way we can prevent the ultimate victory of the Communists in taking over complete world domination is to prevent the enslavement of any more people, to breach the Iron Curtain, and to help those who seek freedom to regain it.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:
IF KHRUSHCHEV GETS BERLIN

We wonder if any of our diplomats has ever bothered to suggest to Mr. Khrushchev that if he gets West Berlin he may have to deal with something even more disagreeable than a bone in his throat.

Take Algeria, for purposes of comparison. Algeria is a backward country with little industry compared with France and a native population that lags far behind the French in numbers, literacy, national consciousness, education, wealth, and pretty nearly everything else. Yet after many years of savage repression, the Algerians have remained in active, armed revolt. They have sustained their rebellion despite the presence at times in their country of something like half a million French troops equipped with tanks, planes, helicopters, parachute battalions, and all the rest of the stuff that a modern army is supposed to have, including firing squads.

To be sure, Algeria isn't Germany. In area it is 20 times the size of East Germany and in population not much more than half as big. In subduing a disaffected Berlin, the Russians could concentrate their forces in a small area but by this very act of repression they might also arouse latent rebellion throughout East Germany.

If the Russian formula—Berlin, a nominally free city in the midst of a recognized East Germany—is accepted, there will be no barrier between the two halves of the city. That can only impose on the Russians the necessity of subduing something like a million and a half West Berliners who will surely be thoroughly discontented. Many of them will be determined to resist.

The hatred of the Algerian rebels for the French is surely no stronger than the hatred of the West Berliners for the Ulbricht regime. The inherent capacity of the Berliners to organize underground resistance and provide it with arms is superior to that of the Algerians. The West German government is not going to guard the border zealously against smugglers supplying arms to blood brethren, and the longer the guerrilla action continues, the less reliable the East German police and militia are likely to become.

Khrushchev might retaliate by exiling Berliners by the hundreds of thousands, but it will be difficult to do this wholesale job in a few weeks or months. Meanwhile, the more severe the repression he attempts, the more determined the resistance is likely to become and the more widely it will spread in East Germany. Equally important, if Berlin is depopulated it will lose its great value to the Communists as a source of manufactured goods of many kinds.

No one can say, of course, that if Khrushchev gets Berlin all these results will follow, but there is plenty of precedent for them and they are well within the possibilities.

A prolonged resistance in Berlin will serve as an inspiration for similar action in Prague, Budapest, Warsaw, and other captive capitals. Anyone who has read European history is aware that once a revolutionary wave starts anywhere in western Europe, it is likely to spread from nation to nation. Mr. Khrushchev may find that instead of having one bone in his throat he has half a dozen, and that instead of merely annoying him, they are choking him.

A College Professor Looks at Russian Roulette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking letter to the editor appeared on August 22 on the editorial page of the New York Times. It was written by a distinguished professor at Wilkes College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Dr. Harold W. Thatcher. I commend Dr. Thatcher's provocative letter to the attention of my colleagues and include it here under leave to extend my remarks:

FACING THE BERLIN CRISIS—WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE HELD TO BE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As the Berlin crisis deepens, with no sign on the part of the West of a willingness to yield an inch, those citizens who give serious thought to the situation cannot but be oppressed with a sense of gloom and impending doom. It seems inconceivable that mankind, whose brains have wrought such miracles in unraveling the mysteries of nature as well as in many other areas, has not the imagination or just plain common-sense to avoid mass suicide. Yet the trend of events compels one to accept the conclusion that this is probably true.

The United States since World War II has displayed a penchant for choosing last-ditch issues and positions which it will defend to the death rather than yield those which are not only most illogical but most indefensible militarily, such as Berlin and Quemoy and Matsu.

Under the present circumstances, insistence on the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin, with the lives of all humanity possibly at stake, is not only unstatesmanlike but inconsistent. We do not, for example, accept the status quo in the satellite countries as unchangeable.

PROPOSALS OFFERED

If the Germans, who a quarter of a century ago were the greatest threat to human freedom, have since become such a bulwark of human freedom that their own freedom must be defended even at the risk of the suicide of humanity, there are many ways in which this can be accomplished without merely standing pat. Probably the best solution would be the demilitarization and neutralization of a wide area in central Europe, including Germany and some of the satellite states, as envisaged in the Rapacki-Eden plans or as suggested in somewhat different form by James Warburg.

Another possible solution would be to make Berlin, or even only West Berlin, a free city occupied by United Nations troops. In such a case the people of West Berlin would be just as free as they are now. They could be just as well defended by United Nations troops as by the troops of France, England, and the United States. In neither case could they be successfully defended if the Russians launched an all-out military attack.

As for the unity of Germany, this is not necessarily a *sine quo non*. It is very doubtful that our allies, many of whose statesmen have lived through two most destructive wars caused directly or indirectly by German militarism, would really welcome a reunified and rearmed Germany. As for the Germans as individuals, let it be remembered that the golden age of German culture occurred, not when Germany was unified, but when it was divided, not in 2, but in 200 or more component parts. We of the West, with our emphasis on the sanctity of the individual, are in no position to argue that national unity is more important than the happiness of the individual.

CHALLENGE TO STATESMEN

The present crisis presents the gravest challenge to our statesmen. To strike a swashbuckling attitude by merely standing pat, daring the enemy to knock the chip off our shoulder, will, of course, win the plaudits of the unthinking multitude in the West. There must be leaders among us, however, who are capable of taking the more courageous, though less popular, course of willingness to negotiate everything except bedrock principles.

If we must fix a point at which we will be compelled to use military force, let it be that at which the Russians move military forces across the borders of a free nation. Everything else can be handled better by nonmilitary than by military means. If, however, we persist in playing chicken or Russian roulette over the Berlin crisis, with the lives of all humanity at stake, then our diplomacy is indeed bankrupt.

HAROLD W. THATCHER.

FORTY FORT, PA., August 12, 1961.

Communicating With People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the battle in the cold war is not only being

fought with economic weapons, in diplomatic arenas, but in an extremely important sense, it is fought in the propaganda arena.

Speaking frankly, I believe that we would all agree that our efforts to counteract Soviet propaganda and display the virtues of our American way of life have been woefully inadequate and unimaginative.

Mr. Speaker, with this thought in mind I place in the RECORD an article which thoroughly and effectively discusses the basic problem of U.S. efforts in the field of international public relations. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Thursday, August 24, and in other newspapers throughout the country. It was written by David Lawrence and was based on his observations during a recent European tour. I insert into the RECORD this article entitled "Communicating With People":

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether, a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well thought out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The overseas broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But, above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called "the public relations of the United States."

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an

organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free-enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by shortwave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist-bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the overseas service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes sophistication. Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts, which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio than the phraseology and big words of over-condensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the Midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communication in foreign policy needs a new look.

Outstanding Newsweek Article Details Cuban Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a very fine article is included in the August 28 issue of Newsweek magazine which I call to the attention of the Members, dealing with the Cuban refugee situation in Miami, Fla.

This article poignantly describes the harsh realities of life facing these desperate, freedom-loving people who have abandoned their family ties and tradition, their possessions, their fortunes in

Communist-infected Cuba to find refuge, freedom, and a semblance of security and peace of mind in this country, particularly in south Florida.

I am proud of the selfless, humanitarian manner in which Miami, with the cooperation of local and Federal governmental officials, religious, civic, and private voluntary organizations, have reacted to relieve the deprivation of these Cuban refugees in terms of food, clothing, shelter, and employment opportunities.

I commend the editors of Newsweek magazine for giving recognition to this heartrending situation which exists primarily in south Florida, but which is in reality a source of interest and concern for all Americans in all of our 50 States.

The article follows:

THE AGONIZING WAIT—THEN THE HARD REALITIES OF A REFUGEE'S LIFE

It has become a twice-a-day ritual. At 2 o'clock every afternoon, at 7 o'clock every evening, a great crowd gathers on the observation deck of Miami's gleaming International Airport. Excitement runs through it like wind through a field of sugarcane as the big Pan American DC-7 appears in the sky, from the direction of Cuba.

There is a moment of tension as the plane taxis to a stop, before its doors open. Will the expected loved one be aboard or not? Nobody can be sure. Perhaps there has been some last-minute hitch, perhaps a sudden arrest. Some in the waiting crowd are biting their nails—like Rosenda Fernandez Larrea, a pharmacist who fled Havana early this month and is now waiting anxiously for his 12-year-old twin sons. Larrea spoke bitterly last week to Newsweek's Karl Fleming. "The Communists were going to send them to a Red youth camp," he said.

As the passengers appear at the head of the ramp, each staring hopefully upward toward the airport observation deck, little knots of people in the crowd erupt into cheers and shouts, frantic waving, sometimes laughter, sometimes tears. Pharmacist Larrea spots his twin sons and is beside himself with joy.

Others wait in silence until the last of the 120-odd passengers has come down the ramp; they wait a little longer, clinging to hope, then finally turn away with downcast eyes. But they will be back for the next incoming flight. And the next, and the next.

Meanwhile, the lucky ones who have espied relatives and friends are pressing around the customs office door. For the next 3 hours, at intervals of about 5 minutes, the door opens and another new arrival is met with a flood of wild embraces. Then the newcomer is borne off, still on a tide of emotional exuberance—to face the harsh realities of the life that awaits him, a penniless and almost possessionless stranger, in a foreign city.

And yet the Miami that most of the Cubans enter—the teeming, crumbling downtown section that sprawls over 5 square miles—will scarcely seem foreign to them. Rather, it is a city foreign to Americans themselves that has mushroomed in the heart of Miami, a city now of about 50,000 people (compared with Miami's population of 300,000), a city whose shops and restaurants and movies reflect a Spanish-speaking populace with its own way of life. It is a city literally bursting at the seams, with as many as three or four families living in a one-bedroom apartment. The problem of coping with its needs—particularly with schooling for its thousands of children—has become almost too much for Miami and Dade County authorities, even with liberal dishings of Federal aid. Yet, despite their

crowded living conditions, their hand-to-mouth sustenance, the Cubans have created surprisingly few problems. Not one refugee has been involved in a major crime in Dade County, which has long blushed at one of the highest crime rates in the Nation.

SOLID CITIZENS

The brighter aspects of the refugee picture are undoubtedly due to the fact that the great majority of the newcomers continue to be—as they have been since the true pattern of the Castro regime first became clear—the island's most solid citizens—well educated, well mannered, business and professional people from the middle- and upper-income brackets; people of character, too, cheerfully undertaking the most menial of unaccustomed labor rather than continuing to accept relief. (Many, in fact, have returned their relief checks after finding work. Repayments, as of this week, were flowing into the Miami Cuban refugee center at the rate of \$10,000 a month.)

Practically all of those who arrive by plane belong to the middle-upper group, though in recent weeks refugees of a different type have been coming in growing numbers to Florida's shores by boat—fishermen, farmers, day laborers, who with wives and children have been crossing the 90 miles of water between Cuba and the Florida Keys in small, often dry-rotted craft. Last week the largest such single group so far put in at Marathon in the Keys: 37 of them, including a number of small children and pregnant women, jammed into a 27-foot fishing boat.

The boat-borne refugees differ in another way from those pouring in by plane. They are strictly illegal entrants, and their right to stay depends on the granting of asylum. Few of them have friends or relatives waiting to help. For the most part, once they arrive at the city within a city, they are consigned to places like the Tamiami Hotel—once the crummiest of Skid Row fleabags—now an emergency shelter. There they can stay with no questions asked until other arrangements are made.

ORDEAL

In a second-floor room of the Tamiami one day last week, a Cuban girl of 18 sat on a bed beside a baby, fat and sleeping, of 11 months. She wore a man's green shirt, black silk skirt, a man's socks, no shoes. She and the baby and seven others had arrived in Key West the night before after 4 days and 3 nights at sea—the motor of their 18-foot boat had conked out and they were towed in by a passing tanker.

Why had she and the others fled against such odds? The girl shrugged. Food in Cuba was getting scarce and vigilante committees were spying on everyone. Her husband thought it was time to get out.

And where was her husband now? The girl shrugged. "Opa-Locka." The name Opa-Locka has come to take on a major significance, especially to these new refugees. It is a former airbase, 8 miles outside of Miami, where newcomers who cannot give satisfactory accounts of their backgrounds are taken for questioning, which often lasts several days. Undoubtedly, such detention works hardships; but the possibility of Fidel Castro's agents being among the boat-borne rattle-taggle makes careful questioning essential.

Otherwise, though, life in the city within a city has taken on a norm of its own. In the supermarkets, signs are printed in Spanish and English, or Spanish alone. Grocers deal mostly in rice and black beans. Butchers have hired Cubans to cut the meat Cuban style. Drugstores sell various herb derivatives and "Florida water," a 75 percent alcohol lotion which Cuban women favor as perfume. Purely Cuban restaurants have sprouted all over, as have Cuban catering

services that send daily dinners of chicken and rice to crowded apartments for \$8 a week.

LATE AND LOUD

Their city has its gaieties, too, though cheap ones. Record shops are doing a boom business in Latin disks and music emanates from apartment windows far into the night. Also far into the night run the street corner gatherings, orderly enough but decidedly noisy. "They haven't given us much trouble," says Miami's assistant police chief, leathery Jim Youell, "but they are quite loud and they will stay up to the wee hours arguing and playing those damn radios and phonographs."

Ironically, it is the devout majority of the refugees that creates one of the big problems: The city's Catholic churches are literally overrun by newly arrived worshippers. At the Gesu Catholic Church on First Avenue, the 11:30 a.m. mass last Sunday was attended by 1,800 persons, almost all Cubans, although seating space is for 1,400 only. Its pastor, Father John Sweeney, said that Sunday masses have been increased to 8 and draw close to 7,000 people; 3 priests now hear confessions in Spanish.

Schooling is about to present a far greater problem. The public schools of Dade County are bracing themselves to enroll an expected 8,500 Cuban pupils when classes begin in September.

Aside from accommodation, the big question is language. The present plan, says Joe Hall, peppery superintendent of Dade County schools, is to proceed as last year, teaching entirely in English and using English textbooks only. But Hall concedes that where the percentage of Cubans is high, "we may have to make some adjustments, maybe dividing the students into American classes and Cuban classes and then teaching the Cubans in Spanish."

Inevitably, all of these problems get worse every day as the plane-loads—and boat-loads—continue to pour in. Very few of the refugees can be persuaded to move out of Dade County, in spite of U.S. efforts to scatter them across the country. Actually, some 6,000 have been resettled in other States—but that doesn't mean much when another 6,000 are arriving every month.

"These people," says Director Marshall Wise of the refugee center, "are different from any refugees in history. Historically, refugees have fled from oppression at home to new countries of asylum where they could start new lives. They burned their bridges behind them. But the Cubans are not here to start new lives. They look upon themselves as temporary exiles. Their every hope, their every desire, is to get Castro out and return to Cuba. They want to stay here in Miami, ready to return the minute Castro cracks."

The Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York State Bar Journal of August 1961.

Judge Halpern illustrates points of legal possibility which are of concern to us all and should stimulate our thinking in the area of world peace through world law.

The article follows:

THE RULE OF LAW

(By Philip Halpern)

(We hear much of "world peace through world law" today. Judge Halpern's address at the Buffalo School of Law, which is here reprinted from the New York Law Journal of July 5, 1961, merits the attention of all New York lawyers interested in the law as an instrument for world peace.)

In its primary sense, the rule of law means the replacement of violence by law. It means the setting up of legal machinery to settle disputes, to adjust conflicting claims, to punish wrongs and to redress grievances. The rule of law prohibits private self-help and private vengeance with their accompanying violence and disorder. The law imposes those wise restraints which make men free. This function of the rule of law, while prosaic, is an important one. It maintains that state of peace and order which makes social and economic progress possible.

However, in modern times, throughout the free world, the term "rule of law" has acquired a broader and deeper significance. It means a system of law which has, as its principal objective, the advancement of the interests of the individual and the protection of the citizen against arbitrary governmental action. The rule of law is based upon the concepts of human dignity and individual freedom which are the fundamental assumptions of our society. The rule of law recognizes the ethical equality of all persons entitling every person to equality before the law and to equal justice under law.

The rule of law thus broadly conceived has its impact upon all three departments of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

As applied to the action of the executive department, the rule of law means that government officials may act only in accordance with duly enacted law, and that, where discretion is vested in them, they must exercise it fairly and impartially. The rights, duties, and responsibilities of the citizen must be prescribed by law and must not be subject to enlargement or contraction at the whim of governmental officials. This is summed up in the phrase in the Massachusetts constitution that ours is a "government of laws and not of men." This concept of the rule of law goes back to the courageous statement of Lord Coke to King James the First that, while the king is under no man, he is under God and under the law.

In its application to the legislative department of government, the rule of law means that legislative power is limited by basic inhibitions embodied in the constitution. Here, the American concept of the rule of law is a distinctive one. In England and in many other constitutional democracies the Parliament is supreme and the observance of fundamental constitutional principles is intrusted to the Parliament's own sense of what is constitutional, in the light of the tradition which binds the conscience of its members. In the United States the power to determine the constitutionality of legislation is vested in the courts. The doctrine of judicial supremacy, now an accepted part of our concept of the rule of law, has had an enormous impact upon the development of our country. There was a period when the U.S. Supreme Court, in the exercise of the power to invalidate legislation, blocked economic and social regulation which the majority of Congress believed to be required in the public interest, but the excesses of that period have passed and legislative freedom in the area of economic and social regulation is now generally recognized. It is in the field of civil liberties that the doctrine of judicial supremacy has made its greatest contribution. Freedom of speech and the

press, freedom of religion, freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, freedom from discrimination—all these freedoms have been given vitality by the alertness of the courts in striking down any invasions or infringements either by the legislative or executive departments. While the basic principle of our Government is rule by the majority, the limitations imposed by the Constitution and enforced by the courts safeguard the rights of minorities against the tyranny of transitory majorities.

The way in which the rule of law safeguards the rights of the individual is best evidenced by the familiar regulations governing criminal prosecutions—all designed to assure fairplay to the person accused of crime and to protect him against the possibility of oppression by governmental authority. Under the rule of law, every person is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. He has the right to be informed of the nature of the charge against him, the right to be confronted by his accusers, the right to counsel of his own choosing, the right not to be compelled to be a witness against himself, and the right to a public trial by a jury of his peers. In civil proceedings, too, every person is entitled to a fair hearing before an independent and impartial tribunal in the determination of his rights and obligations.

It is self-evident that, if the rule of law is to function effectively, the judicial department of government must be manned by able, courageous and impartial judicial officers. But judges do not function alone. The work of the courts is, in Bentham's phrase, that of "judges and company;" the words "and company" refer to the lawyers. Under our adversary system of litigation, the implementation of the rule of law depends upon the work of the advocate. As Justice Jackson has said, all our civil liberties are only "paper" rights until some able and courageous lawyer stands up in court and gives them reality. The bar recognizes that it is the duty of the lawyer to take unpopular as well as popular cases. This includes the case of the person who is charged with a crime against which public emotion may run high. The bar also recognizes that it is its duty to provide counsel, without compensation, for indigent persons accused of crime; the rich and the poor alike are entitled to be represented by counsel. In this way all persons are assured of "equal justice under law."

The rule of law so conceived and so enforced has advanced and protected the rights of the individual in this country to a degree equaled in very few countries and surpassed in none.

The rule of law as conceived throughout the free world is based upon certain fundamental moral premises, sometimes expressed in a written document like the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, sometimes left unexpressed but nevertheless all pervasive. These fundamental moral principles are sometimes stated in religious terms in accordance with the teachings of the world's greatest religions; sometimes they are stated in secular terms as fundamental human rights derived from the inherent nature of man, as in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These principles set up minimum moral standards with which any system of law must comply if it is to be regarded by civilized men as representing a true rule of law. Without this moral base, law may become an instrument of tyranny and, as experience in the last few decades has demonstrated, it may become the means of depriving the members of a minority of all human rights and, ultimately, depriving them of life itself. As a result of this recent experience there has been a great increase of emphasis among lawyers and legal philosophers upon the moral element in law. So we find Professor Wechsler saying at the 1955

Harvard Symposium on Government under Law, that all the participants were "united in belief in norms of right and justice that transcend positive law, yielding criteria by which all government and law may properly be judged."

The concept of the rule of law, as it prevails in the western world, is very different from that prevailing behind the Iron Curtain. The difference grows out of a fundamental difference between our view and theirs as to the nature and function of government. We regard government as an instrument for the advancement of the welfare of the individual, whereas the Communist concept is that the individual exists for the service and aggrandizement of the state. Freedom of dissent and freedom of public criticism of governmental activities are incompatible with the monolithic Soviet society. Personal freedom cannot be countenanced by a totalitarian dictatorship.

In the discussions in the United Nations, as might naturally be expected, the emphasis by the delegates of the Soviet Union has been upon equality rather than freedom. It is possible to have equality in a society which has very little freedom, since all the members of it may equally be deprived of their freedom. There is the equality of the inmates of a prison. Even on the score of equality, there are striking examples in the Soviet Union of the application of the principle satirized in Orwell's "Animal Farm," where it was declared that all animals were equal but that some were more equal than others.

It is idle to talk about the rule of law in a closed society like that of the Soviet Union. An independent judge vested with power to declare executive or legislative action invalid is obviously unthinkable in that kind of society. A true rule of law in the Soviet Union can come about only with a complete change in the nature of the society.

There has been an effort in recent years to apply the concept of the rule of law to the promotion of social and economic interests, as well as to the protection of civil liberties and political rights. The demand for such an extension has come from the underdeveloped countries in which the struggle to reach a bare subsistence level occupies the interest and concern of the people to the exclusion of everything else. Thus, the final resolution adopted by the Congress on the Rule of Law, held at New Delhi, India, in 1959, proclaimed that "the rule of law is a dynamic concept . . . which should be employed not only to safeguard and advance the civil and political rights of the individual in a free society, but also to establish social, economic, educational and cultural conditions under which his legitimate aspirations and dignity may be realized." We may well sympathize with this movement to expand the concept of the rule of law, but I think it is a mistake to so dilute the concept as to deprive it of all specific meaning and to make it an all-embracing synonym for all the social, economic and cultural aspirations of the people. The rule of law, as it has historically developed in the western tradition, has a tremendous significance and great value in the protection of the rights of the individual. We ought not to risk the loss of that significance and value by trying to bring within its coverage the wholly different problems of the social and economic development of the underdeveloped peoples. Those are social welfare problems which are better dealt with, according to our view, by expanding programs of economic aid and technical assistance rather than by trying to stretch the concept of the rule of law to embrace them.

There has also been an effort in recent years to apply the concept of the rule of law to relations between nations. A beginning has been made in the United Nations. Under the United Nations Charter, aggression is forbidden and the use of force to settle international disputes, except in self-defense,

is renounced. But the U.N. is not a super-state and does not have the power of a super-state. Because of the inherent limitations and weaknesses of the U.N., some students of the subject have advocated a stronger organization, under the banner of "World Peace Through World Law." They argue that world peace can be attained by the rule of law in the same way in which domestic peace has been assured by it. But the rule of law in domestic affairs is part of the functioning of a sovereign government. The establishment of an equivalent system in international affairs would require the creation of a world government, vested with legislative or policymaking power to settle conflicts of national interest and with the executive power and military means to enforce its decisions. In order to assure peace with freedom and justice, the sovereign authority would have to be given not only the power to resist aggression but also the power to deal with the underlying economic social and political causes which may lead to armed conflict. A world rule of law in this sense is a dream for the distant future; the world is far from ready for it.

As Sir Hartley Shawcross has said, if we wish to deal with this problem in terms of slogans, the slogan should be "World Law After World Peace" rather than "World Peace Through World Law." Only after the cold war between the East and West has been terminated, and mutual trust has been established, can we seriously consider the organization of a world society based upon the rule of law. And this precondition cannot be brought about until the forces of international communism abandon their aim to conquer the world. If and when that should occur, we could undertake the extension of the rule of law throughout the world, not only in its primary sense of replacing violence by peaceful processes, but also in its broader sense of protecting the rights of the individual against the action of his own government.

As we celebrate the achievements and value of the rule of law we should also remind ourselves of its limitations. As Justice Jackson pointed out after his return from Nuremberg, the experience of Nazi Germany demonstrated that there are inherent limitations upon the power of the courts. Justice Jackson said: "I know of no modern instance in which any judiciary has saved a whole people from the great currents of intolerance, passion, usurpation, and tyranny which have threatened liberty and free institutions." He joined Judge Learned Hand and John Lord O'Brian in preaching to the people with the eloquence of the ancient prophets that the responsibility was ultimately theirs and that no court could save their liberties if the people themselves did not value them highly enough to place them first in their scale of values. If the people placed ahead of freedom other values such as economic security, the comforts of life or peace at any price—then freedom would be lost. Unless the people of this country dedicate themselves wholeheartedly to the ideal of freedom, the rule of law cannot save their freedom for them and, indeed, the rule of law itself cannot survive.

Anti-Communist Instruction for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Herald Express recently carried

an editorial cartoon of particular significance. It showed a bombastic character labeled "Leftwing American Strategists," snatching out of the hands of an American soldier a document entitled "What Communism Is and How To Fight It." The cartoon was titled "Yours Not To Reason Why, Yours But To Do and Die."

The editorial accompanying the cartoon read as follows:

Muzzling The Services

Perhaps one of the greatest shocks to the people of this Nation in peacetime was the order to commanders of military services which has practically shut their mouths against attempting to imbue their troops with patriotism and knowledge of the enemy, communism.

Imagine what would have happened if such an order had been issued while our fighting men were engaged in the First World War against Germany, or the Second World War against Germany and Japan.

It is all right to say, we are not at war now, but we are right on the doorstep, and the American people should know more about the present enemy who has threatened to "bury" us and to annihilate 140 million people.

And yet the troops who will have to do the fighting if war actually comes have been denied the privilege of having leaders or lecturers tell the truth about the enemy they must fight.

Who is responsible for this order?

According to dispatches from Washington, the roots lie in what is referred to as a memorandum from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

In this memorandum, Senator FULBRIGHT objected to military sponsorship of public forums featuring what he referred to as "radical rightwing speakers." No reference was made to "radical leftwing speakers."

Subsequently, there was a Defense Department directive on the subject.

All over the country, this chilling influence is now being felt in the services. Generals, admirals, captains, colonels, and those of even lower rank are afraid to open their mouths for fear of being disciplined from the very top.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, is hotly critical, referring to this insidious memo as attacking efforts of military leaders "to give American citizens the facts about communism and the cold war."

Senator THURMOND has charged that Communists originated an "anti-anti-Communist campaign subtly concealed behind a nonexistent conflict between civil authority and military leadership."

He said the campaign is focused principally "in an attack on our military leaders."

The South Carolina Senator also declared that "there is specific evidence that attempts to create the impression that this administration wants anticommunism soft-pedaled have borne fruit."

He added that he certainly did not believe either the President or responsible officials in the administration want anticommunism soft-pedaled.

But he also charged that "this censorship of military men's speeches spills over to the point where it allows no criticism of any Marxist-Socialist-Communist theories or practices."

Just where does this leave the common, ordinary citizens of America? At the least, it leaves most in a state of utter confusion.

It leaves before them a frightening question as to the future of this country.

At about the same time the Herald-Express ran the above items, the Long

Beach Press-Telegram ran a letter to the editor along much the same lines. It reads as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HITTING ENEMY?

EDITOR:

President Kennedy should instruct the Department of Defense to initiate forceful anti-Communist programs and cease from subjecting patriotic Americans to harassment, censorship, and disgrace, as for instance, Major General Walker and Admiral Burke.

It seems now to be becoming popular in the National Government to investigate and censure military men who have any words of warning to say about Communist influences in American life.

Men who have fought in wars must wonder what kind of struggle we are waging when it becomes a censurable offense to discuss the tactics of the enemy.

Even though our peril is so great, we find a situation developing where military commanders are in danger of being charged with rightwing political theories if they have the temerity to call attention to our danger and point out the methods used by our enemies.

We are counting on the President to help save our country and shall be praying for his wisdom and guidance.

IDA H. K. JENSEN.

The disturbing thing both the Herald and Mrs. Jensen hint at but do not discuss in detail is that not only do people in the armed services need basic instruction in what communism is and how to fight it, but Americans generally. Both anti-Communists and anti-anti-Communists tend to intermix politico-socio-economic issues legitimately within the framework of American political action with the question of communism.

By way of extreme examples it works this way: The anti-Communist properly denounces communism and seeks to fight it; he also holds strong beliefs about keeping the private enterprise system uncontaminated by such things as say, social security; although he may not intend it, soon his listeners are gaining the impression he is labeling "social security" as "communism" and anybody that is for it is a Communist. Then along comes the anti-anti-Communist. He is for social security; although he may not intend it, soon his listeners are gaining the impression that anybody against social security is some kind of a nut and therefore anybody that is against communism must also be some kind of a nut.

I repeat that the foregoing example is extreme, but it illustrates the point, many who may be on either side of this issue understand the nature and danger of communism so vaguely, at least, in relation to what is not involved and what is involved, that the business of how to get on with disposing of the challenge to freedom gets obscured by the resulting oratorical smog. And it is precisely this, meeting and disposing of the challenge, that is our vital business today. Muzzling the services under the drooping banner of anti-anticommunism only serves dangerously to gum up that business. Mixing up a lot of non-anti-Communist issues with legitimate anti-Communism merely gums it up in another way.

What we really need, and what thus far our Government and even our

schools have failed in great part to supply, is a nationwide education program which deal sensibly and understandably with just what communism is and just how to fight it, without mixing it up with anything else.

And we must never forget, that the job of fighting it successfully is one which requires mobilization of the spirit and efforts of every American in Government, service and in private life. It seems to me that Mr. Kennedy should dramatically fuze this country's effort together to do this job. A good way to start would be to require every person on the Government payroll, from himself on down, to satisfactorily pass a good course in "What Communism Is—and How to Fight It" before he can draw his paycheck.

Midway in Jet Age Is Like Ghost Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, August 23, 1961, the House passed House Resolution 420, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the problems involved in, and the measures to minimize or eliminate, aircraft noise nuisances and hazards to persons and property on the ground.

During the discussion of this resolution, great emphasis was made of the complaints registered by residents in the area of an airport about the effects of the jet age on their daily lives.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared on the front page of today's Chicago Tribune concerning the economic problem developing at Chicago's Midway Airport, also the effects on thousands of families and businesses in the area once considered the world's busiest air terminal.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the existing problems that face the residents within the area of Midway Airport as explained in the following article:

MIDWAY IN JET AGE IS LIKE GHOST TOWN

Chicago's Midway Airport, 8 miles southwest of the Loop, and for almost 20 years the world's busiest air terminal, has lost its crown.

The jets, with their demands for enormous runway lengths, have passed it by. Today the activity that once concentrated at Midway has shifted over to the still developing O'Hare complex west of Park Ridge.

Out at Midway every phase of the field's operations has changed radically.

CLEAN BUT EMPTY

The temporary terminal that withstood the ravages of a million passengers a year right through the 1950's although it was to have been torn down and completely rebuilt in 1947) has attributes of a ghost town.

However, the corridors are clean and polished. The snack bars and restaurants now have plenty of seats and elbowroom, whereas only 20 months ago customers often stood three deep in the postmidnight hours.

The parking lot is only half full these days. Out on the airplane aprons at the passenger loading gates, the scene is even more desolate.

NO MORE WAITING

Until recently, the 54 gates at Midway were stacked constantly with 4-engined propeller-driven aircraft, then queens of their fleets. Arriving planes often would sit with engines turning on parking runways for 40 to 50 minutes, waiting their turns to pull in and discharge their passengers.

Now, even at the so-called peak hours of noon, 5 p.m. and 8 p.m., there is no waiting. In fact, the airline ramp chiefs say, there are always two or three gates for each plane, arriving or departing. The crews no longer are dodging through a maze of whirling propellers to give service to airplanes.

Up in the Midway control tower, which was known the world around as the most hectic spot for controllers, the tension is gone. The experts there, who once were able to keep a stream of planes separated safely for simultaneous landings on two runways—as many as 150 movements an hour—are grateful for even a small private machine to enter their control area.

"We're running an old ladies' home," one of them said.

The change has extended beyond the airport boundaries. The nearby motels, hotels, restaurants, bars, service stations, and parking lots are suffering a lack of business, too. Proprietors are singing the economic blues.

A DIFFERENT ATTITUDE

Effects also extend to thousands of families whose homes are nearby. Many wage earners depended directly on airport jobs or on businesses associated with airport activities. Many who worked for airlines or service groups at Midway are being transferred to O'Hare field and their families are talking of moving north, too.

Alderman John Egan (13th), who for years was in the midst of the turmoil caused by homeowners objecting to noise, low aircraft, and other airport nuisance gripes, has suddenly encountered a different attitude.

Objectors to Midway and its operations have virtually disappeared. Instead, Egan now is conferring with committees of businessmen, realtors, and homeowners whose pleas today are: "What can we do to keep Midway in business?"

Civic groups from 13 southwest suburban areas joined last January to fight the "jet menace" at Midway. They thought at that time that United Airlines would attempt to place its new Caravelle jets there, but this development did not occur. The Caravelles went to O'Hare with the other jets and United reduced its piston engine traffic still further at the south side airport.

Now the civic groups have changed their attitudes. Few want jets but they are "frankly and definitely alarmed" by economic changes already brought on by the departure of air traffic from Midway.

SOME STILL OPPOSE JETS

"It is not than anyone really will welcome jets at Midway," Egan explained. "It's that the property owners are alarmed about the worsened economic situations there. They now feel that if the jets are necessary, they can be tolerated."

"Even now, however, about a quarter of those living in the Midway area are bitterly opposed to any jet innovations. These people live in the flightpaths, and remember the trials with the Caravelle about a year ago. These trials occurred on a warm day and windows were open and people heard the strange new sound of the jets and they didn't like it."

The alderman said that thousands of persons who a year ago had signed petitions protesting against jets for Midway now have changed their minds. Most of them believe that "maybe jets are necessary to keep the field going."

FIGURES SHOW DECLINE

Figures for scheduled airline operations for Midway and O'Hare Fields are astonishing. In July 1960, Midway had 19,634 arrivals and departures, but this had dropped in July of this year to 10,868. O'Hare's July 1960 movements were 10,064, while this year they had climbed to 16,962 (most of them jet operations).

Perhaps the reports from the parking lots at the two large airports give a better picture of Midway's decline. Midway's July 1960 figures were 103,361 cars, whereas O'Hare's in the same month were 61,882. But in July 1961, Midway had only 49,209, and O'Hare had 126,175.

Coal Industry Logic, if Any

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the running attacks of the coal industry on New England consumers of residual oil would be farcical were it not for the unhappy fact that the coal industry has been able to persuade the Federal Government that residual imports actually are a major cause of the coal depression.

The following editorial from the Boston Herald, and letter to the editor, from the president of the National Coal Association, put the situation in sharp focus:

COAL INDUSTRY LOGIC, IF ANY

This is the unkindest cut of all: The coal industry gets New England's supply of cheap residual oil cut down so as to promote coal sales here, and then expresses surprise that we make a fuss about it.

Seems we ought to like to have our imports of this cheap fuel restricted.

President Dunn of the National Coal Association thinks we should be grateful that the coal industry is protecting us from the insecurity of relying on shipments from Venezuela.

In his letter to us, printed in an adjoining column, he asks what became of the \$318.7 million we say the import quotas on this oil have cost New England. The answer is the coal industry got some. The coal carriers got some. Holders of import quotas got some. And the rest went into that cavernous maw that always opens when a shortage puts an end to competitive pricing.

Mr. Dunn says the President [Eisenhower] ordered import quotas on residual to protect the national security. But Mr. Eisenhower spoke only of the security of a healthy petroleum industry. Residual imports do not affect the domestic oil producers, for whom residual is a negligible product. If war cut off residual to New England, it would also cut off exports of coal, which would then be available here as an emergency fuel.

As if to say who's hurt? Mr. Dunn says residual imports to the east coast increased from 172.2 million barrels in 1957 to 212.7 million in 1960. His arithmetic baffles us. In 1960 the total of allocations issued under the import restrictions was 154,559,292 barrels. Licensed imports as of April 1 this year

were 461,000 barrels a day or the rate of 168,265,000 barrels a year. What is Mr. Dunn counting as barrels of oil available to east coast consumers?

Mr. Dunn's reference to Soviet oil is equally baffling. The Soviet wants to sell crude oil, not residual, and that's another matter.

The energy Mr. Dunn and his organization uses to force a fuel shortage here could so much better be used in constructive ways to aid the coal industry.

COAL WOULD SAVE NORTHEAST FROM HERSELF TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Perhaps the Herald can help locate the \$318.7 million which your July 30 editorial says New England and other east coast areas contributed to the bituminous coal industry last year by reason of restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil.

Nobody in the coal industry seems to have seen the money. Perhaps this is because we understand neither your logic nor your arithmetic. The editorial says restrictions on residual oil imports have resulted in the sale of an additional 1.5 million tons of coal, with a value at the mines of \$5 a ton. If we accept that premise (we have to start somewhere, though the average value of coal f.o.b. mines in 1960 was only \$4.73) we find \$7.5 million.

But what happened to the other \$311.2 million?

Maybe the \$311 million went to the oil importers. You say import restrictions have increased the price of residual oil by 33 cents a barrel over the world price, and that the scarcity "has wiped out competition and invited profiteering."

Who are the profiteers? Not the coal industry. I suggest you direct your abuse to the quota-holding importers whom you cite without censure as being able to "enjoy a 30-cent premium without having to handle a single barrel of oil."

Restrictions on residual oil imports were ordered by the President to protect the national security, not the coal industry. Even under controls, shipment of foreign residual oil into the east coast rose from the 1957 level of 172.2 million barrels, the original basis of the restrictions to 212.7 million barrels in 1960. The fuel shortages of World War II in New England proved the danger of heavy reliance on tanker-borne oil supplies.

If the Herald advocates unrestricted imports of the cheapest available fuel without regard for national security, I can put you on the trail of a bargain. Press reports indicate that a New York firm has been offering oil from Soviet Russia at substantially below the market price. Of course, the Russians might pinch off the supply once our hospitals and factories grew dependent on it, and once other sources of energy had withered away—but meanwhile, look at the money you'd save.

If the folly of this course is apparent, so also is the folly of unrestricted imports of residual oil from the Caribbean along a sea route subject to Soviet submarine blockade.

STEPHEN F. DUNN,
President, National Coal Association.

VFW Gives Copley Its Highest Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the San Diego Union:

VFW GIVES COPLEY ITS HIGHEST AWARD

MIAMI, FLA., August 22.—The Veterans of Foreign Wars today presented its gold medal of merit and citation to James S. Copley, publisher of the San Diego Union, in recognition of positive Americanism.

The award, the highest which can be granted by VFW Commander in Chief Ted C. Connell, was made in a ceremony here at the national convention of the veterans' organization.

The medal which Connell presented to Copley was inscribed "Awarded to James S. Copley for exceptional services rendered to country, community, and mankind."

HAILED FOR LEADERSHIP

The citation commended Copley for "his personal leadership in directing an effective and positive Americanism program through comprehensive reporting and interpretation in all affiliates of Copley press."

Copley, a Navy veteran of World War II, is chairman of the Copley Press, Inc., which publishes 15 daily newspapers in Illinois and California, and operates a worldwide news-gathering service.

The VFW gold medal, established in 1946, last year went to John Daly, then of the American Broadcasting Co.

AWARD TO SENATOR

Another top VFW prize, the Americanism award, today was presented to Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida.

Copley told the convention in a speech following the presentation that newspapers and other communications media must redouble their efforts to protect the American way of life from the onslaughts of communism.

"We are at war with an ideology determined . . . to stamp freedom from the face of the earth," Copley said.

"As a newspaper publisher, it is my conviction that newspapers can help create a community in which everyone individually comes to gain a feeling of importance in the preservation of our way of life, against the threat of totalitarian government."

Copley cited the recent formation of the education department of the Copley Press, Inc., as a step toward this expanded service to the communities in California and Illinois in which Copley newspapers are published.

He said its purpose is to "carry on . . . the work of education in behalf of our system of government, and our publicizing of the benefits of the American system."

"Too few of our younger people have had the benefits of our own bringing up in patriotism," he said. "They need the facts not only about the good things implicit in our own way of life, but the evil things that are implicit in the great conspiracy that is slowly closing in upon us abroad."

KHRUSHCHEV REPORT

The VFW convention was reminded of the report last January 6 by Premier Nikita Khrushchev at a Moscow meeting of representatives of the world's 81 Communist Parties.

"We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism," Khrushchev had said. "But we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

"Our danger is mortal," Copley said. It is clear, he said, that Khrushchev plans that the Communist world "will wage relentless war against the free world until the last capitalist nation is overcome" and that the United States is the No. 1 target.

ULTIMATE HOT WAR

While it may not now be to the advantage of Communists to wage a hot war, Copley observed, Khrushchev holds that nations which continue to resist the cold war ultimately will be defeated with a hot war.

"We are too young a nation to die," he said. "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor—the last more important than anything—are at stake just as much today as they were in 1776."

"The American people are crying for leadership . . . The leadership must come. It must come from organizations like the VFW, and it must also come from newspapers and other news media. The people must be informed and summoned."

"In fact, the American people already seem to be ahead of their Government in demanding that we escape from this blind, dark alley into which the Russians have tried to trap us."

ACCEPT CHALLENGE

The American people know that Americanism is too precious "to skulk down the wrong side of any alley just to avoid the bully's challenge," Copley added.

"We must again walk bravely," he said. "We must lead the world's timid and fearful. And with our example, they, too, will walk tall and straight. With courage, we will all emerge into the broad, clean streets of an orderly world."

"We are not outnumbered," he concluded. "So far, we have only been outtalked."

"We must do our own talking. We must do it in honesty and conviction. We must do it so all the world will hear and understand and applaud."

PATRIOTIC TEACHING VITAL, CADETS TOLD

PENSACOLA, FLA., August 22.—James S. Copley, chairman of the corporation of Copley Press, Inc., today called for American teachers "who will be aware of the flag in the corner of the classroom, and know that that flag is what stands between us and a godless slavery."

Copley addressed cadets at the Naval Air Training Command here. He spoke under auspices of the Pensacola Council of the Navy League of the United States. Copley is president of the league's San Diego council.

"Some people have wrapped themselves in the flag of freedom of education, so they can feel safe from challenge, while they work to destroy that freedom," he said.

SOME SCOFF

Copley said there are those "who scoff at patriotism as an old-fashioned, outdated thing."

"This voice finds too common an expression on our college campuses. It asks us to put aside our individual God and country in favor of a new belief in superman. This superman is a combination psychiatrist-statesman-jailer who will lead us away from patriotism and free enterprise into the security of a totalitarian world prison."

Looking out over the ranks of Navy flight cadets, Copley remarked that "this is a university campus not concerned with misinterpretation of our freedoms to allow Marxists and atheistic Communists to preach their treason."

In his speech, the publisher stressed his support of freedom of education, but he added, "All freedom is grounded in responsibility, and I am afraid that that responsibility has not been always applied on American campuses."

REQUIRED SUBJECT

"I, for one, want communism to be a required subject of study in our classrooms," he told the cadets. "But I want it to be dis-

cussed by patriotic teachers who also can teach Americanism; and who want to do it."

Copley pointed out that the American way of life has become the envy of people all over the world.

"The Communists certainly recognize this fact and realize that in the United States is the only obstacle to their plan for world domination," he said.

"How clearly is this taught by our colleges and high schools?"

"How many teachers can tell this story of human achievement?"

"If we do not have such teachers, our days as a Nation are numbered. And we are too young to die, too young a Nation to let fall the torch of individual freedom, of individual responsibility for government."

WILL LOSE FREEDOM

"Without old-fashioned patriotism, we will lose our old-fashioned freedom. Without old-fashioned love of country, we will fall victims to old-fashioned hate by other countries."

Copley reminded the cadets of the charge of Adm. Arleigh Burke, who retired recently as chief of naval operations.

"Burke's testament to the Navy contained the words:

"I do commend:

"Love of country, overshadowing all other loves, including service, family and the sea."

"Individual desire to excel, not for aggrandizement of self, but to increase the excellence of the Navy."

"Devotion—perhaps consecration—to personal integrity in oneself, in one's service, in one's country."

"Courage to stand for principle, regardless of efforts to dilute this courage through compromise or evasion."

NO GREATER REWARD

Copley told the cadets that "the golden wings that will be won from this command may well be the means of perpetuation of our American way of life."

"What reward could exceed this," he asked, "the knowledge that you, in your generation, helped to save that way of life?"

Price Fixing Under Guise of Fair Trade Is Blow to Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, any type of price fixing by the Government, even though it is done in the interest of so-called fair trade, ultimately reacts against the interest of the consumer, which is all the people. Fair trade proposals now before Congress will do nothing but increase prices and rob the consumer of his freedom of choice. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

REENTER THE PRICE FIXERS

Fair traders never fade away, it seems; they just change their names.

Despite defeat after defeat in the courts and nearly 50 years of congressional coolness, the proponents of Federal retail price fixing are massing a new campaign in Washington. As our Mr. Duke reported the other

day, they realize that most people now recognize the once-attractive fair trade label as a fraud, and so the advocates are calling it a fair competitive practices bill.

The immediate objective is to get this thing passed by the Senate at this session, and then work on the House next year. If it actually got enacted, we would have a situation where it would be impossible, by Federal law, for any merchant to sell a national branded item to consumers at any price lower than that set by its manufacturer.

That objective points up one of the difficulties: The history of fair trade in the States that have tried it is that it doesn't work, no matter what any law says. Attempts to enforce it had a lot to do with the rise of the so-called discount houses, which in turn led to discounting by many other retailers.

Now, by a remarkable exercise in illogic, the fair-competition lobby points to the growth of discounting as an argument for enacting their bill. But of course discounting is the essence of price competition, and its rise is a tribute to the vigor of our competitive system when it is left halfway alone.

What is basically at stake is the consumer's freedom of choice, and particularly his opportunity to buy at the cheapest price. An economy without that is neither free, competitive, fair, nor efficient. Yet that freedom is what these zealots are trying to kill. And no matter how many times they change their names, they can't change the smell of price fixing.

Big Push in Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the attention of every Member of the Congress a thorough—but very disturbing—article on the Soviet Union's massive propaganda machine at work in the world today. Written by Eugene Burdick and William Lederer, this article spells out in detail the wide, and at the same time, concentrated propaganda effort of the Soviet Union, which reportedly is spending at least \$2 billion a year in its diabolical scheme to capture the hearts and minds of men, particularly in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa. With our own U.S. Information Agency having an uphill struggle to obtain some \$135 million appropriation for fiscal year 1962, it means that our country is spending almost 20 times less to sell America and our democratic institutions abroad than the Kremlin is to sell, falsely and with sugar coating, its communistic form of government.

Today, the Soviet Union and Communist China are publishing and distributing—many of them free of charge—some 2 billion books a year, and this is more than the total books published by all the rest of the countries of the earth combined. The Russians and the Chinese are distributing movie films on life in their countries, and radios which are tuned only into stations in Moscow and Peiping, throughout Asia and the Middle East. Furthermore, budding and

established authors in these underdeveloped nations are being paid large sums of money by the Soviet Government for articles written for Communist publications to be distributed in their own countries and "intellectuals," authors, teachers, scientists of these Asian nations are being given the "red carpet" treatment on all-expense paid trips to Russia as official guests of the Red government.

When I visited Asia and the Middle East 2 years ago as chairman of the foreign trade policy subcommittee, I saw the tremendous number of free Soviet and Red Chinese books, magazines, and pamphlets of all kinds on stands and in libraries; sadly, I found no American books or publications of any kind to counter this massive amount of Communist propaganda literature. And I was in Asia as chairman of a congressional committee which seeks to promote American private investment in the underdeveloped nations, and this Communist literature, I soon realized, was a tremendous barrier to the effectiveness of my mission.

All of this points to the great need for our country to increase many times over its educational and informational efforts in order to show the peoples of the world the true superiority of our form of government and our way of life where men truly are free and untrammelled. I have long thought that the first forward step in this direction would be to remove the current legal restrictions on the spending of counterpart funds earned abroad under Public Law 480. Under this law, moneys earned in some 60 foreign countries may be spent only in those nations and cannot be repatriated to the U.S. Treasury here.

Great sums of foreign currencies presently are lying idle in foreign banks—not yet committed to the USIA or any other agency, nor allocated for any particular program. In President Kennedy's budget message for fiscal 1962, it was revealed that there now exists uncommitted and excess foreign currencies available to our government in India, Israel, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Poland, Spain, the United Arab Republic and others; the total money estimated to be available after payment of all U.S. requirements for fiscal 1962 is \$650 million.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 634) which if enacted would remove the present spending ceilings on these funds, and thus enable the U.S. Information Agency to increase its programs—particularly the publication and distribution of literature, and the making and distribution of motion pictures—in order to meet the great Soviet challenge in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and the Middle East. The simple fact is that the increased spending of these "counterpart" funds would not cost the American taxpayer any additional expense.

My bill has received favorable reports from the USIA, and from the Departments of State and of Agriculture, and I am hopeful that it will be passed by this Congress. The increase and build-up of our informational program is vital to the security of our country.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this arti-

cle, "Big Push in Soviet Propaganda," which appeared in the August 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, in the RECORD.

The article follows:

BIG PUSH IN SOVIET PROPAGANDA—TO PRESENT A BROTHERLY AND BENEFICENT IMAGE, RUSSIA BACKS A GLOBAL ORGANIZATION WITH TREMENDOUS POWER AND BIG MONEY—A REPORT BY THE AUTHORS OF "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

(By Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer)

In Manila a young Filipino writer opens an envelope, finds a check for 750 pesos—the largest sum he has ever received for an article. Twenty-eight hundred miles to the southwest at the airport in Ceylon, an anxious mother and her paralyzed son are carefully placed in a plane and before the plane has made altitude a doctor is examining the boy. Five thousand miles to the northwest, in a sunny Russian schoolroom, sixty 8-year-old children expectantly face the door, waiting for a distinguished dark-skinned visitor. When he enters, they sing a song of welcome in Hindi, his native language.

Three rather touching scenes—but they all bear the mark "Made in Moscow." These three episodes are typical of thousands that occur around the world as a part of a comprehensive Communist propaganda program. Only recently have Western scholars been able to put together the fragments of this massive Soviet propaganda apparatus and make educated estimates of its range.

Americans, used to the bluster of Khrushchev and the blatancy of May Day parades in Red Square, will be surprised at the delicacy with which this devastating, yet invisible, structure operates.

In the opinion of many experts this propaganda machine is more dangerous than nuclear-armed ICBMs. The Soviet effort costs \$2 billion a year directly and probably twice that much indirectly. By contrast the United States spends about one twentieth as much in money and one one-hundredth as much in effort and intellectual skill.

The Soviet effort is not merely massive. To a startling degree it can pinpoint small targets. Take the three examples mentioned. The Filipino writer had received his check from the Foreign Language Publishing House in Moscow. Although he is a professed "Philippine nationalist," he is now receiving over half of his income from Soviet royalties. The anxious Ceylonese mother with the paralyzed son was flown to Moscow, where her son was given treatment at a polio institute and returned home much improved. The mother, in addition to being an influential journalist, is related to the secretary of a powerful Ceylonese politician. The class of Hindi-singing children were Russian students at a public school in Moscow and their guest was a prominent Hindi-speaking Indian intellectual. When he returned to India, he praised the Soviet Union's "brotherly interest in India and its culture."

The painstaking details of the Soviet effort are stunning. Grassroots indoctrination begins in the Soviet school. All Soviet pupils start serious study of a foreign language in the third grade. By the time they have finished high school they have had at least 6 years' training in a foreign language. They do not confine their language training to English, French, Spanish, and German, but also have thousands of students studying the so-called exotic languages of Africa and Asia. In Singalese and Bengali, the Russians have a small army of fluent linguists. Our Department of State's Foreign Service does not have a single qualified person, although these languages are spoken by almost 100 million people living in important sensitive areas.

Language is not the whole of propaganda, as we shall see, but it is the vital first step. John Foster Dulles put it this way: "Inter-

preters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language; and, without understanding their language, it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

Soviet language training is so sweeping that Moscow can, if the occasion calls for it, produce tomorrow a skilled plumber who speaks Hindi and is also familiar with the great figures of Hindi literature. As long ago as 1957 Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, said that he had never met a Russian in that country who was not working hard at Hindi, or already reasonably fluent in the language. American officials who are fluent in Hindi could comfortably meet in the livingroom of an average American home.

What are the results? When Moscow contracted to build the Bhilai steel mill for India, a great many of the Russians, from steel muddlers to top engineers, could speak to Indians in their own language. The Indians were so pleased that they did not object when Russian workers taught Russian and Marxist doctrine to Indian workers during the lunch hour.

In Swahili, Nepali, Telugu, Annamese, Amharic—languages spoken by 86 million people—the pattern is the same. The Soviets have platoons of people trained in all these languages. Most Russians will not see duty overseas, but if the need arises the Soviet propaganda apparatus can call upon an immense reservoir of language competence. By contrast, consider that this year only four of our Foreign Service officers are studying southeast Asian languages.

But the real cutting edge of the Soviet propaganda apparatus is the full-time, highly trained expert who skillfully directs his army of assistants. When he goes to work, overseas or in Moscow, he will have survived one of the world's most rigorous indoctrination and screening programs. He is a professional who has been schooled more extensively than a physician. Take, as a composite example, the case of a fellow we'll call Serge Rasonnikov.

Serge was graduated at the top of his class from a high school in Minsk. He was assigned to one of the numerous "institutes" that exist throughout Russia for specialized training in language and area studies. For the first year the average workday was 16 to 18 hours. Serge was one of 25 students making up a class in Twi, a little-known language which is spoken by 2 million people in the northern part of Africa's Gold Coast region. Language make up one-half of the institute's program, and it was taught by an African Communist, specially recruited. The other half of the curriculum consisted of an intensive course in the anthropology, religion, politics and geography of Africa.

At the end of the first year the 25 students were told where each ranked in the class. The bottom five students were dropped from the institute.

For 36 more months the work continued. When the class finally was graduated, it consisted only of five superior professionals. The Russians' estimates of their need for experts in Twi were five per year. Two of the students had been discharged from the institute for "marriage without official permission." The rest were casualties of the competitive system. In addition to scholastic brilliance, other criteria were taken into consideration in grading students—physical stamina, ability to make decisions and boldness.

Serge was one of those who survived. Serge had acquired not only the ability to speak Twi fluently but also knowledge of the Twi folk myths. In addition he knew the names of contemporary political leaders in the areas where Twi was spoken, their backgrounds, their weaknesses.

A few months before being graduated from the institute Serge and the four other surviving students were each assigned a secret topic on which to write a master's thesis. Unbeknownst to any of the five the topics were identical—A Marxist-Leninist Strategy for Twi-Speaking Cultures: The Next 10 Years. Near the end of the term each student was presented with a copy of the other four theses and asked to defend his own publicly in the light of what the others stated. To Western educators such a technique would be not only unethical but extremely cruel. In the Soviet view it produces a potential diplomat-propagandist who is suspicious, tough minded and highly flexible in his application of Communist ideology.

The institute decided that Serge was their most outstanding graduate. The four other graduates were at once ordered to twi-speaking areas of Africa where they took jobs in the Russian Embassy or consulates as chauffeurs, kitchen helpers and messengers. They were given these jobs to permit extensive contact with the natives. Later they would move into propaganda jobs.

Serge remained in Moscow and was sent to the diplomatic school for an additional 2 years. The U.S.S.R. Diplomatic School is top secret. No American, to our knowledge, has ever visited there. A few foreign Communists have briefly attended the school and after defecting from the party have described what takes place in that highly guarded institution.

The first task of the school is to instill in every student an identical notion of the grand sweep of Soviet strategy and "tactical flexibility." The aim of that strategy is to assure the world domination of socialism. "Tactical flexibility" means that in each country, at some time in history, the ever-changing problems will be different and must be handled differently. In some countries it will be possible to move quickly—to give history a push. In others it will be necessary to go more slowly, to mask Soviet intentions, to work in feigned sympathy with unsatisfactory local movements.

Serge also was taught such practical skills as the art of "spontaneous demonstration." The antiriot procedures of police all over the world were carefully studied so that they could be circumvented. Serge personally will never participate in such a demonstration. But he will give the triggering order to the local Communist leaders. The Communists, for example, carefully controlled the pitch and tempo of the Zengakuren student demonstration against the Japanese visit of President Eisenhower. The Communists in Tokyo, vastly outnumbered in the Zengakuren organization by moderates and conservatives, maneuvered the others during the last 3 days before the President's scheduled visit. The result of this tactic was a stunning historical cataclysm. The sovereign head of the world's most powerful nation was prevented from visiting another head of state. To this day most of the members of the Zengakuren, who howled in the streets during those days, are not anti-American and are not quite sure how they were manipulated. For Serge, such a performance is a routine technique.

A former Communist once told us, we thought jokingly, that one of the things taught at the diplomatic school was "the moment for producing the proletarian corpse." By this the ex-Communist meant the technique of mysteriously killing or wounding a well-known native leader—especially one in revolt against white officials. The result of the murder usually is a violent flareup of native rage against those in authority. To succeed in such a political maneuver requires great skill. One of the problems of the propagandist is to calculate accurately when the moment for the murder has arrived—and how to have the corpse "discovered" most effectively.

In recent years we are not so certain that our ex-Communist friend was joking. With an eerie consistency, political deaths around the world inflame insurrections and benefit the Communists. From Laos to Vietnam to the Congo there is a thin, red, bloody strand that is almost surely not accidental.

Upon completion of his studies at the diplomatic school, Serge was ordered to a Soviet embassy in Africa, where he at once had a consultation with the Russian political boss. In most Soviet embassies the ambassador is not the No. 1 man but is only a figurehead. He is the one charged with the energy-consuming task of showing up at social functions. If the ambassador absorbs a staggering number of vodka toasts and a huge amount of caviar at such functions, he can spend the next day recovering. The important political work is done by others who have time to think and study. Usually the real leader of the embassy will occupy what is officially the third or fourth position.

Serge was given almost a completely free hand. The camouflaged "No. 1" said he would issue specific orders only when a change in tactics or strategy came down from Moscow.

At first Serge concentrated on influencing strategically placed persons. Serge also saw that Twi poets, writers and intellectuals had their work translated and reviewed by Tass and in Pravda, or in one of the many specialized journals within Russia. The reviews invariably glowed with praise. Serge made certain that the local intellectual received a Twi translation of the review—as well as substantial royalties.

In the second phase Serge generated an impression of great Soviet admiration for the "folk culture" of the host country. The Soviet press published editorials insisting that selected native intellectuals be invited to Russia as state guests. Such visits were lavishly prepared and widely reported.

In Russia the surprised Africans found themselves surrounded by people who were not only friendly but apparently genuinely well informed and deeply interested in the culture of their own country. Writers who had barely been making a living suddenly began to receive handsome checks from Moscow for work that was translated into Russian. Musicians and artists received the same heady attention.

We once asked a group of Asian intellectuals, all of whom had received royalty payments from Moscow, if they knew that no American or British writer was able to receive royalties for works published in Russia. There was an embarrassing silence. We asked, half-jokingly, how many of them would be willing to return their royalty checks to Moscow as a gesture of "solidarity" with their American literary colleagues.

One of the Asians, more candid than the others, stated, "It is impossible. I am now dependent for approximately 50 percent of my income on Soviet royalties. I could not afford to do as you ask, and I am ashamed of that fact." Most of the writers professed to be unaffected politically by their Soviet incomes.

But a young Indonesian writer told us, "It is difficult to avoid unconscious seduction. The first few articles I wrote for the Communists were fair and objective, and they printed them precisely as I wrote them. Each time they paid me more than I had received before. After a few months, however, they began to suggest slight editorial changes: Would I object to the placing of the word 'imperialistic' before 'American'; would it not be accurate to describe Eisenhower, a former general, as a 'militarist'? If I balked they quietly went along, but they kept the pressure on—partly by raising the payments. One day I finished an article and on rereading realized that it was straight Communist doctrine. I tore it up and have not written for the Communists since."

He is a rare exception. But let us return to Serge.

Serge's next step was an intensive program of cultural exchange. Here Serge took Japan as an example. In 1957 a distinguished Russian pianist, Gilels, made a Japanese tour. This was quickly followed by a tour of the singer, Alla Glenskova. In 1958 the Russians invited the Japanese puppet theater, Avidzi, to Russia, where it received wildly enthusiastic reviews. The Russians also made it known, pointedly, that this was the first trip that the puppeteers had made outside of Japan's borders. Scholars, scientists and famous Russian artists too numerous to mention all visited Japan. In return, numerous groups of Japanese were invited to visit Russia.

Japan is a fully developed society, and Japanese are likely to recognize propaganda techniques when they see them. Even so, the Russians have made a serious propaganda penetration and are constantly working hard to enlarge it.

In the primitive and emerging nations the Soviet effort is proportionately much higher. Communist entertainers and artists and journalists flood to countries like Liberia, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Iran, Lebanon, and all the Arab countries.

In Burma, Russian circuses and Chinese entertainers went to tiny upcountry hamlets where the people had never before seen a foreigner. In some cases the Russian circus staff was larger than the village population.

Serge followed the established propaganda pattern closely. Once key people are cultivated and a mask of friendliness exhibited to the masses, the propaganda dagger is aimed at other victims. The next target group is students. They are invited to fairs, youth festivals, cultural meetings, and universities—all in Russia. Preparations are carefully made. For example, student delegations arriving in Russia from France and Great Britain and the United States, who have some knowledge of Communist techniques and are therefore likely to be suspicious, are housed in drab, ordinary dormitories. But the delegations from Africa, the Arab countries, and southeast Asia are housed and fed in plush luxury—candle-lighted tables, a menu meticulously put together with careful attention to religious requirements and native food tastes, and cheerful waiters.

Perhaps the high point in the propagandizing of students took place in 1960 when Khrushchev, while visiting in Indonesia, announced that the Soviet Union had established a "University of Friendship of the Peoples." This university is designed to train engineers, physicians, teachers, and technical experts from all over the world. If successful, it might make it possible for communism to capture the intellectual elite of most of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Fortunately the first few classes did not go well. But the Russians are experimenting; the curriculum of the Friendship University has just been changed.

The countless festivals and youth congresses in the Soviet Union are carefully and generously subsidized. Students from the poor nations pay little or nothing. But the Soviet aid is always carefully presented as a "fellowship" or as a reward for winning a contest or some such face-saving device.

Once an atmosphere of friendliness is established with the intellectual elite and the organization of students in underdeveloped countries is under way, the next step is a careful wooing of the leaders. With a shrewd eye for protocol, the Russians first send a high-ranking diplomat to call on leaders such as Sukarno, Haile Selassie, Nehru, or the Shah of Iran. The foreign head of government is then invited to the Soviet Union. There is no limit to costs.

Take the visit of Nasser, the ruler of Egypt, to Russia. He was flown in a luxuriously equipped Soviet jetliner, the TU-104. When he arrived in Moscow, he was greeted by orderly files of people cheering as he drove down the street. Scrubbed schoolchildren threw flowers at him wherever he went. At small, intimate parties Nasser was shown examples of Egyptian and Arabic works translated into Russian, some of them consisting of his own speeches, which had been catalogued as "masterpieces." He met Soviet Moslems who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While traveling in Russia he was shown factories making the most sophisticated military equipment, parts for guided missiles and earth-moving equipment. The implication was clear: The Soviet Union was not only powerful in war but able to supply the kind of equipment needed to build the Aswan Dam; and she could supply seed and farm machinery for the lands to be irrigated by the dam.

At a splendid "state dinner" Khrushchev assured Nasser of the support of "the whole socialist world" in his "struggle for independence." Nasser was also informed that the Soviets had just established a Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With the Countries of the Arab East.

The usual concluding flourish to such a trip is making a gift of the jet plane in which the foreign leader has traveled. Haile Selassie, the Shah of Iran and Sukarno have received such "gifts." U Nu of Burma flies in a plane presented by the Russians.

The Russians pay special attention to local customs. They know, for example, that Indonesians prefer lengthy movies. The longer the show, the more the Indonesians like it. It is no accident that President Sukarno exhibited the 3-hour motion picture of his trip to Russia in preference to the 30-minute movie documentation of his visit to America made by our U.S. Information Agency.

The foreign leader, thus manipulated, sometimes leaves the Soviet Union with the impression not only that the Russians are deeply interested in his country, but that Russia is the "coming" economic and military power. No one lectured him on the "inevitability of world communism." He has met the real leaders of Russia and may have the impression that he can "do business with the Russians" without compromising his position.

The results are alarming. Today in Egypt there are thousands of Soviet technicians, military advisers and engineers. Instruction in the Russian language has begun in secondary schools of the United Arab Republic. Three hundred of her best students are being sent annually to Russia to study.

Now Russia is ready for the last stage of propaganda: "The socialization of the masses." This means a penetrating and widespread propagandization of the citizens of a foreign country. The blueprint of action is clear. In most of the emerging countries where Serge—and a thousand others like him—serves, the public-communication system is either primitive or nonexistent. One of Serge's first steps in socializing the masses will be to see that small radios are distributed to the outlying villages by the native Communist Party. These radios have one peculiarity: They receive only one station—Radio Moscow or Radio Peiping. Powerful broadcasting stations in Russia and China fill the air with programs in Amoy, Tonkinese, Tibetan, Pashto, Bengali, Berber, and hundreds of other languages. In deserts, deltas, and farm areas the entire population of tiny hamlets will squat around the radio in the evening hours. As the young people crank the hand generator, the village listens to Bing Crosby, the Red Army chorus, classical music, folk music of their own land—and a carefully edited version of world news. American press reports are rewritten to make us look as bad and unhappy as possible.

The Communists also realize that intense literacy drives among the emerging nations creates a new market for books, magazines, and newspapers. Today the Russians and Chinese are the biggest publishers of books in the world. Between them they produce more than 2 billion books a year, which surpasses the entire output of all other nations. A large fraction of these volumes are published in foreign languages, ranging from obscure African languages, like Fang-Bulu and Kabyle, to Japanese and German. Children's books which successfully convert Cinderella and Little Red Riding Hood into Communist heroes are put out in fine editions, beautifully illustrated. Millions of magazines are distributed throughout the world, each of them aimed at a specific audience: the peasant, the trade-union member, the city worker, and the disgruntled intellectual.

Today the world's best selling author is Joseph Stalin. His books are followed by the Bible, but the next three most widely read authors are Communists. A bookseller in Cairo or Djakarta or Bangkok or Singapore finds it financially attractive to stock Communist literature. First, he pays for the books in the local currency, directly to the Russian or Chinese Embassy. Secondly, their cost is low and the profit is high.

The accumulated local currency resulting from local payments is used by officials like Serge to establish native newspapers and journals. Normally there will be an "overt" Communist newspaper, which concentrates on lengthy analyses of Marxist theory. It is usually turgid and has a small circulation. But Communist money also flows to the "covert" newspapers. They carry neutral titles such as "the Star" or "the Chronicle" and are jammed with popular features attracting a mass circulation. With no visible Communist connections, these papers carry on bitter campaigns against "white colonialism" and the presence of American troops overseas.

Hand in hand with books and newspapers, the Communists have been engaged since 1955 in a stepped-up production of motion pictures. Among other advantages, use of this medium assures that illiterates are not overlooked. In 5 years the number of Communist propaganda films has quadrupled.

Serge is familiar with all these techniques. He has the personnel and assets to use instantly whatever method he judges most effective. Serge can order any Russian in the area to take on a propaganda project; and each receives a specific assignment in addition to his normal job. Whatever money or equipment is needed Serge can get quickly from Moscow. Films, money, printing presses, newsprint, books, a grand ballet—these will be flown in at his request. The Russian Government is organized for this kind of operation. The propaganda agency in the U.S.S.R. has a status equal to that of the Foreign Service or Department of Defense.

There is only one thing Serge may not do: He may not fail. If he makes one major mistake, he is ruined. He will be recalled and placed in a minor post for life. The same applies to everyone involved in Russian strategy and tactics.

Compared with the Communist effort the American venture into propaganda is anemic. Not only is the USIA budget severely limited, but so is its statutory function. It can only project the American image abroad. It is paradoxical that America, where the communications arts are most highly developed and where the technical skills are so far advanced, should be such a slow starter.

Our USIA people are on the whole as intelligent and perceptive as their Russian counterparts. But they are paralyzed by inadequate funds, too frequent shift in

posts, and sketchy training in the language and customs of the area they serve.

The Communists are not infallible. They have made great mistakes. Their ruthless suppression of the Hungarians, the inhumanity of the collective farms in China, and other events have nullified many of their propaganda drives. Then, too, the Soviet Friendship University is by all accounts a dismal place that offends many students. Yet few Asians or Africans are aware of these facts. All in all, the Russians make more mistakes than Americans do. But the Communists have the funds, trained personnel, and organization to take advantage of—or create—American fumbles. We are slow to act.

There is nothing at this moment to prevent Americans from creating the intellectual and technical weapons required to win the great battle for exposing the minds of men to the truth. The Communists already have a formidable machine at work telling lies. Americans can overcome it. All that is lacking at the moment is an awareness of the danger and a determination to do something about it.

Best Way To Strengthen Negotiations With Soviet Union Over Nuclear Test- ing Is To Remove Our Own Self- Imposed Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

MR. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Times shows clearly how foolish it is to continue any kind of negotiations with the Soviet Union unless we speak from a position of strength. For 3 years we have allowed the Soviet to make propaganda hay out of the nuclear test ban negotiations. We have adhered to a self-imposed ban on the testing of nuclear weapons which has helped reduce our lead over the Communists in this field. I pray, before it is too late, that we resume nuclear testing. Let us continue the talks, if Khrushchev wants to talk, but let us negotiate from strength by letting him know that we are not going to be lulled into a false sense of security by Communist peace offers in agreements which they have no intention of keeping.

The article follows:

NEW SOVIET MOVE ON TEST BAN SEEN—DELEGATE SUDDENLY CALLED TO MOSCOW FOR CONSULTATION

GENEVA, August 24.—The Soviet Union appeared today to be preparing a surprise to greet the return to the Nuclear Test Ban Conference here of Arthur H. Dean, chief U.S. delegate.

Semyon K. Tsarapkin, the Soviet delegate, boarded a plane here this morning in answer to an unexpected summons from Moscow to return for consultations.

The United States and British delegations were not informed until late last night by the Soviet delegation that Mr. Tsarapkin was leaving.

The Western delegations were assured that the Soviet negotiator would be back in Ge-

neva for the next scheduled session of the Conference on Monday.

FLURRY OF EXCITEMENT

Mr. Tsarapkin's sudden departure only a few hours after the U.S. delegate's return from 2 months of consultation in Washington caused a flurry of excitement and speculation.

The excitement was caused by the timing of the move and the absence of any prior hint of it.

The nearly 3-year-old conference had been dawdling along with only one meeting a week because neither side had anything to offer except recriminatory speeches over the causes for the long deadlock. The East and West disagree on the amount of inspection that would be necessary if nuclear tests were banned.

The Soviet Union apparently appeared willing to have Mr. Tsarapkin wait here patiently to hear what the United States negotiator would have to say when Washington decided to send him back.

Speculation by well-placed Western sources in Geneva centered on the possibility that Moscow might have decided on some dramatic move. The aim would be to undercut the effect on world opinion that the United States hopes to achieve by sending Mr. Dean back. The United States is trying the demonstrate again its desire to make every effort to get a workable test ban treaty.

On Wednesday the United States released a booklet on the negotiations in which it warned that the Soviet Union would invite the resumption of nuclear tests if it again rejected proposals for a treaty banning such tests.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

The stress placed by President Kennedy on the importance of the mission given to his negotiator and the obvious desire of the United States to impress on world opinion the sincerity of its attempts to get a reasonably controlled treaty may have influenced Moscow to act, according to speculation here.

Moscow, it is believed, may want to counteract the propaganda benefits the United States may score at the nonaligned nations' parley next month in Belgrade and at the forthcoming regular United Nations General Assembly session.

Conjecture here is that Moscow will try to steal the play from the announcements that Mr. Dean is believed to have ready. These are expected to state that the United States is still looking for areas of possible accommodation despite the Soviet demand for a right of veto over all control operations.

The veto is inherent in the Soviet plan for three co-administrators for the proposed control organization to represent the West, the Communist bloc and the uncommitted states. The East and West originally agreed to a single neutral administrator independent of all governments.

Monongahela Power Co., a Progressive Electric Firm in West Virginia, Receives Excellent Newspaper Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

MR. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to invite the attention of my colleagues to articles which have appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Ga-

zette during the past week citing the "Electric Firm Unique"—the Monongahela Power Co., with main offices at Fairmont, W. Va.

In an era when so-called public versus private power controversies can be aroused quickly even on marginal issues, it is proper that we pause to give thought to the fact that neither public nor private power is necessarily all good or all bad but that there are definitely pro-public investor-owned utilities generating and marketing electricity just as there are progressive public power facilities. By the same token, we know that there are abuses and inequities in some elements of both investor-owned systems and public power projects.

In this instance, Mr. President, I am privileged to accentuate the favorable as it relates to the Monongahela Power Co., a subsidiary of Allegheny Power System, Inc. I have had a special familiarity with this company over the years because it has serviced my home area in West Virginia, and the survey findings made by Charleston Gazette Staff Writer John G. Morgan in two articles in that newspaper are consistent with my personal understanding of Monongahela Power's policies and marketing practices.

By and large, West Virginia experiences with its investor-owned utilities has been excellent, as have been those with our energetic REA cooperatives. American Electric's subsidiaries, Appalachian Power and Wheeling Electric companies, under scrutiny as close as that of-forded Monongahela by Gazette Staffer Morgan, would merit equally favorable consideration and reporting, according to the best information available to me.

In our area, of course, coal fires the boilers which create the steam for production of electricity. Vastly improved technology has made our electricity-from-coal plants among the most efficient in the world, just as mechanization of the mines has increased productivity and efficiency in the coal industry. These developments have enabled our power producers and marketers to hold their rates to consumers at a stabilized level while most other fuels and forms of energy have experienced mounting costs which have had to be passed on to consumers.

This, of course, is one of the features noted by Gazette Staff Writer Morgan in his articles on the Monongahela Power Co., the very able president of which is my esteemed longtime friend, Don B. Potter, one of our State's most active and enlightened leaders in business and civic affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the August 24 and August 26, 1961 issues of the Charleston Gazette, both relating to the Monongahela Power Co.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE INCREASES, DISCOUNTS OUT

(By John G. Morgan, staff writer)

FAIRMONT.—At least one major utility company in West Virginia never has received

a residential rate increase. Moreover, it never has asked for one.

That rather remarkable company has adopted policies which set it apart from some other utility firms. It grants no free service and no discounts on its residential rates.

Believes that the salaries of its executives are properly a matter of public knowledge; pays no country club fees for its employees. Pays no lobbyist to stalk the legislature. Permits no personal use of company cars.

Named Monongahela Power Co., the unusual utility establishment has its headquarters here. It serves 32 counties in northern and central West Virginia and small areas in Ohio, Maryland and Virginia.

It is a subsidiary of Allegheny Power System, Inc., of New York. Within the system, three companies function under the control of the Monongahela firm. They are Marietta Electric Co. of Ohio, West Maryland Power Co. of Maryland and Monterey Utilities Corp. of Virginia.

Monongahela has approximately 1,580 employees and 225,000 customers. The principal cities served are Parkersburg, Weirton, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Morgantown, Vienna, Weston, Elkins, Buckhannon, Grafton, New Martinsville, and Wellsburg, all in West Virginia; and Marietta, Ohio.

The company's record of no rate increases and no requests spans the 48-year history of the Public Service Commission. The electric system now embraced by Monongahela was started in 1890—23 years before the commission was established.

A company publication says: "Never has Monongahela, even in the face of rising labor and material costs, raised the price of residential electric service." A search of commission records confirms that statement.

Among all utility companies in West Virginia, Monongahela doesn't stand alone if each item on its list of established policies is considered separately. But if the whole list is considered, along with the fact that no increases in rates have been granted, then the Fairmont company apparently occupies a unique position.

The residential rates charged by Monongahela are considered low. However, generally speaking, all electric rates have remained relatively low in West Virginia while gas and telephone rates have been climbing rapidly. Executives of gas and telephone companies say that the nature of their problems has compelled them to seek higher rates more often than the electric firms.

Appalachian Power Co., which serves southern West Virginia, has made only rare appearances before the commission. Its rate increases in recent years have been relatively tiny, and it has effected some reductions. Appalachian's rate of \$7.15 for typical monthly use of 250 kilowatt-hours compares with the Monongahela rate of \$6.93 to \$7.31.

Monongahela's president is Don B. Potter, who joined the company 32 years ago as an industrial engineer. He succeeded A. C. Spurr as president in 1955.

Potter is chairman of an advisory committee for the State department of commerce. He headed a similar group with the State's economic development agency before the new department was created this year.

The president, a native of Pottersdale, Pa., was graduated from Carnegie Tech with a degree in mining engineering. One of his first ambitions was to be a power sales engineer—one who sells industry on the idea of using more electric power. But he got into the executive end of the utility business with Monongahela and decided that he liked it, especially from the standpoint of building the local economy and making community improvements.

Potter said his firm always has followed a policy of permitting no free or discount electric service for anyone. He said that policy applies to all executives or employees on the charges for service in their homes.

"The executives pay the same as the janitor," he said. "We have never given this any other thought. It is just something that should be paid."

"Our employees pay their grocery bills and buy their gasoline. They pay their church dues. Why shouldn't they pay their electric bills?"

He said he hadn't considered whether free service or discounts might be considered illegal under West Virginia law. The company's attorney J. B. Sabel, declined to venture an opinion on the question.

Potter said the company does permit small discounts on equipment sold at its appliance stores. The discounts for employees amount to 25 percent on new equipment and 10 percent on charges for repairs. Equipment is sold to ministers and charitable organizations at a 10-percent discount.

The company sells appliances at 39 locations, mostly in areas where other establishments don't carry a complete line of heavy electrical items for household use. Sale of the equipment is regarded as a promotional effort for the use of more electricity.

The president said that up until about 10 years ago the company paid the country club fees of executives and other employees whose duties made it important to associate with business contacts in the elaborate environment of the local organizations.

Payments were stopped, he said, after the company decided they weren't a "proper function" of the firm. But, he pointed out, the company made salary adjustments so that the personnel involved could pay their own dues.

In each of several small towns, the company follows a policy of paying the dues of one employee in a civic club, Potter said. This employee is called a "public contact man."

In some towns, the contact man is required to join the club.

Potter noted that the company also pays for the membership of some employees in junior chambers of commerce. "We consider this a fair training ground," he said. "Of course, we make sure that the employee has an interest in the activities of the chamber."

No lobbyist is hired by the company simply because he isn't needed, Potter said. However, the firm sometimes sends its representatives to legislative meetings when matters of importance arise.

Policies concerning use of company cars are very strict, he said. As a practical matter, all personal use is denied. A few employees, including general line foremen who might be called to meet emergencies at any hour, are permitted to drive home in company cars.

All company cars, with one exception, are classified in the low-price field. The exception is a Chrysler used by the president * * *

POWER FIRM FINANCIALLY HEALTHY WITH HISTORY OF NO RATE HIKES

(By John G. Morgan, staff writer)

FAIRMONT.—"We believe that the Monongahela system should give the best service at the lowest cost to the most people within its territory, consistent with fair wages and satisfactory working conditions for its employees and a reasonable profit for its stockholders."

That's the creed of the Monongahela Power Co., which never has asked the public service commission for a residential rate increase.

Furthermore, the company doesn't intend to ask for a rate increase in the near future. "We will hold for awhile yet," said President Don B. Potter.

How has the company managed to hold the line in the past?

Potter's answer included references to a reduction in operational costs, automation, and higher temperatures and pressures

achieved through efficient use of coal in the generation of electricity.

His answer is directly related to the two outstanding reasons he gave for the long-range success of the company. Those reasons are: early recognition of the need for economic area development and emphasis on reduction of generation and transmission costs.

The company has three power stations—at Rivesville, Marion County; Albright, Preston County; and at Willow Island, near St. Marys on the Ohio River.

A second generating unit was added to Willow Island less than a year ago at a total estimated cost of \$26.6 million. It is designed to burn low grades of coal with maximum efficiency.

Principal offices of the company are here in a 7-year-old, \$1.5 million building owned by the New York Life Insurance Co. The building, of a functional-type design, is occupied on a long-term lease basis.

The leasing arrangement is comparable to that used by United Fuel Gas Co., which occupies a \$7 million building in Charleston. That structure is also owned by the New York Life Insurance Co.

On every hand, there is evidence of continued growth and prosperity of Monongahela despite the fact that the company never has raised its rates.

Last year, Treasurer E. C. Withers said, the company's total revenues amounted to \$39,750,000. Out of that sum, \$5,516,000 in Federal taxes and \$39,966,000 in other taxes were paid. After payment of taxes, operational expenses, interest, stock dividends, and any other necessary items, the company enjoyed a net profit of \$5,755,000.

The net return on investment has been averaging between 6 and 6½ percent annually for several years, Withers said. In lean years, he said, the figure has dipped below 6 percent.

As another indication of the company's financial health, big industry type salaries are paid to executives, and all employees are entitled to liberal welfare benefits. Members of the board of directors receive fees that apparently are within the range of those paid by large private corporations.

Potter was paid a salary of \$45,000 last year—\$5,000 more than he received the previous year, Public Service Commission records show. In addition, he received \$1,567 in fees for attending board meetings last year, or \$36 more than the previous year.

Salaries of top executives in the company last year:

Executive Vice President E. C. Summers, \$31,000; Vice President J. G. Gorman, \$21,500; Vice President R. S. Soule, \$27,000; Vice President G. E. Vest, \$21,500; Comptroller A. L. Adams, \$20,400; Treasurer Withers, \$20,400; and Secretary G. J. Jackson, \$12,900.

There are 14 members on the company's board of directors. Each, with one exception, received \$1,567 last year for attending 12 board meetings. The exception was a new board member who received only \$933, apparently because he didn't attend all the meetings.

The total paid to directors last year is in keeping with a new fee schedule, which authorizes payment of \$133 per person for attending a monthly board session. For several years previous to 1960, the fee was \$100 per meeting.

Potter said he believes the salaries paid to the company executives are in line with those paid by private industrial concerns in the general area. He expressed the same opinion about directors' fees.

The president pointed out that several members of the board live out of the State, but they receive no expense money for attending the meetings. Some live as far away as the New York area.

Members of the board besides Potter and Summers are J. L. Rice, Jr., president of the Allegheny system; E. S. Thompson, chair-

man of the Monongahela board; E. W. Wilkinson, the new member; H. D. McDowell and M. G. Miller, nonsalaried vice presidents; G. A. Banington, T. H. Blodgett, H. F. Butler, Randolph Catlin, J. A. Hill, A. B. Richardson, and G. M. Schurman.

Monongahela's annual report for 1960 shows that the company spent \$858,562 in pensions and \$226,081 in additional employee welfare expense.

Vice President R. S. Soule explained, however, that a much more liberal interpretation of welfare expenses could bring the total up to about \$3.5 million, or \$1.04 per man-hour.

His compilation included pensions, vacations, time lost due to bad weather, all types of insurance and recreation, the cost of putting out a company newspaper, and a half hour each day per employee for coffee breaks.

As still another indication of financial health, the company contributes regularly to charitable organizations. Potter holds to the prevailing view among top utility officials that the contributed money should be counted as operational expense.

Under that view, the company's customers would have to pick up the tab. However, the public service commission has adopted a policy requiring the money contributed to charity to come out of the pockets of stockholders.

The continuing quest for industry, with a rather heavy investment in time and money, is probably one of the best signs of the company's financial condition and its high hopes for the future.

About 50 active industrial prospects are kept within striking distance of the company's area development bait most of the time.

"We will do better when we can land 1 out of 10 good industrial prospects, or 1 out of 50 among all the prospects," Potter said.

Some Responsible for Projecting Image of United States Do Not Understand What It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following article from the Washington Evening Star, written by David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence points out the need for better communication with the people of the world and I agree with him completely:

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well-thought-out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win

the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The overseas broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called the public relations of the United States.

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free-enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by short-wave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist-bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the overseas service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes "sophistication." Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts, which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio

than the phraseology and big words of over-condensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communication in foreign policy needs a new look.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that some who are responsible for projecting our image to the peoples of the world, do not understand or they have forgotten what the image really is. I call your attention to a news article from the Washington Evening Star, quoting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the effect that he believes it is a function of the Federal Government to help people to become self-supporting:

RIBICOFF ENDORSES HAVING ABLEBODIED WORK TO GET RELIEF

WASHINGTON, August 24.—Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said today that wherever possible a person on relief should work for the money he received.

He would favor Federal participation in such work relief programs, he declared, but emphasized the necessity for what he termed proper safeguards. Under present law, no Federal money can be contributed to State or local work relief programs.

Mr. Ribicoff discussed at a news conference studies he had underway of the entire Federal welfare structure, with emphasis on possible changes of aid to dependent children program.

He expects to make recommendations to Congress in January for changes in the children program and possibly in other welfare fields, he announced.

"I think that to the fullest extent possible a person who can do work should do it for the welfare or relief money he receives," he stated.

"The Federal Government, however, should not and cannot assume the responsibility which is the responsibility of a local community. This is a complicated problem."

He declared it a "discredit to our society that we have not provided a system which helps succeeding generations to become self-supporting."

Mr. Speaker, it was never intended by the founders of our country that the Government should feed, clothe and house the people. We cannot, under a free enterprise system, provide through Federal Government agencies complete welfare for all those unable or unwilling to work. The best way we can help future generations to become self-supporting is not through extending Federal welfare programs, but freeing the people from the heavy burden of such programs so that the free enterprise system will be given full opportunity to function and make possible a better life for all the people.

Employment in the Dynamic American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Special Projects of the House Republican Policy Committee recently issued its final report on "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy."

The August 19 issue of the magazine Business Week took notice of this project in an article entitled "GOP Tries New Way To Harness Scholars."

The person who was responsible for this excellent achievement is our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. Mr. CURTIS deserves the thanks of all of us, myself included, who were privileged to be associated in the project with him.

I am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

GOP TRIES NEW WAY TO HARNESS SCHOLARS

A group of Republican Members of the House this week climaxed a unique experiment in economics and politics with a demand for a fresh approach to the problem of unemployment.

This contingent, led by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, has for 6 months been examining unemployment with the aid of 24 academic economists. The scholars volunteered their services in response to appeals sent out by CURTIS.

The project will not end with the filing of a formal report by the academicians, which is all that usually happens when Congress enlists the advice of scholars. Under a plan devised by CURTIS, the 48 Republicans who took part in the project were divided into task forces, each taking up some facet of the unemployment problem.

The House group represents a wide range of viewpoints, from archconservative, JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, to liberal JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York. Each task force worked with an economist who prepared a background paper on the assigned subject. If the members of the group didn't understand the professor the first time around, a new draft was prepared.

When the task force was satisfied, members would discuss the paper in speeches on the floor of the House and introduce the study itself into the record.

SUMMING IT UP

Altogether, 21 such group efforts are now in the RECORD, topped this week by a speech by CURTIS, who summarized what the group thinks should be done to reduce unemployment. Among the conclusions:

There are more unfilled jobs in the country than there are unemployed persons.

The chief cause of joblessness is not automation but deficiencies in vocational training and the job-locating services of the U.S. Employment Service.

Retraining is essential, but more should be left to management and labor unions than the Kennedy administration proposes.

The tax laws should be modified to help bring jobs and the jobless together.

CURTIS and his group accuse the Kennedy administration of taking a defeatist attitude toward reducing unemployment. And CURTIS, individually at least, is willing to con-

cede that the Eisenhower administration also failed to grapple with the real nature of the problem.

PROFESSIONAL VIEW

The professors did not join in the policy conclusions of the group, nor were they asked to.

Plans are underway to publish the background papers and the comments of the participating Members of the House in book form. CURTIS and his supporters think it could give the GOP a fresh start in tackling unemployment as an economic problem and a political issue.

CURTIS has long been exposed to the ideas and methods of professional economists as a member of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. He has been aware that, when it comes to marshaling academic talent, the Democrats usually outgun the GOP. On the issue of unemployment, CURTIS set out to equalize matters.

The result is a project that calls on the talents of such economists as Clarence D. Long, of Johns Hopkins; Robert Triffin, William J. Fellner, and Henry C. Wallich, of Yale; Howard S. Ellis, of the University of California; and Nell H. Jacoby, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Some of the economists have Republican leanings. Wallich and Jacoby, for example, both served as members of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower. But Long is an active leader of the Democratic Party in Maryland, and Triffin is an adviser to President Kennedy on international monetary problems.

CALL FOR CHANGES

Now that the papers are in, the CURTIS group is calling for changes in Federal and State policies, geared to the central idea that there's no reason to accept any given level of unemployment as tolerable as long as newspapers are loaded with help-wanted ads.

"There's an actual shortage of labor," CURTIS argues.

The first goal of retraining, CURTIS told the House this week, should be the jobs that are going unfilled. He quotes officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as saying that Negroes are being trained for jobs that are disappearing. CURTIS believes this same mistake is going to be made by the Kennedy administration unless retraining is preceded by a nationwide study of jobs.

CURTIS accuses the Department of Labor and the Office of Education of competing in bureaucratic warfare rather than coordinating Federal efforts to make vocational guidance and training fit actual needs. He believes the Armed Forces—"the biggest educational system in the country"—ought to train men with an eye on civilian job needs.

TAX REFORMS

This week's summary of the group's ideas stressed two changes in the tax laws. One would allow the cost of retraining to be deducted from income; the other would declare the legal residence of workers to be where their jobs are, not where their homes are.

Under present law, per diem expenses for workers away from their legal residence are not allowed beyond a limited period, after which the expense money is taxed as ordinary income. CURTIS argues that this is a hardship on workers at isolated projects, and one reason for the difficulty in matching jobless men with manless jobs.

CURTIS also criticized the unemployment insurance laws of 40 States, which cut off unemployment payments during a retraining period. The whole direction of policy should be in the other direction, CURTIS argues. He suggests that the laws could be rewritten to force anyone off the rolls who refuses retraining, though he adds that this may be too severe.

The group includes two standbys of Republican economic policy among its recommendations: balanced budgets to avoid inflation, and rephrasing the Employment Act of 1946 to include stable prices as a goal of Federal policy.

America's Growing Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there is a steadily growing awareness in our country that its progress, its standard of living, and its way of life are not fortuitous accidents; that these are part, parcel, and products of the political system under which we have thrived. This awareness involves a sharpening respect for freedom; personal freedom, political freedom, and economic freedom. It also involves a sharpening perception of the challenges to those freedoms hurled not only by the international Communist conspiracy, but as well by those who would compromise them under the banner of socialism.

Editorial Columnist Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, recently wrote of these matters, as follows:

WHERE IT HURTS

The parlor pinks and other leftwingers are being hit where it hurts. They are seeing a nationwide upsurge of young people who are worried over the danger of communism. All over the Nation groups are studying the actions and achievements of communism. They do not like what they see and are making their views known. They are calling a spade a spade, and the so-called liberals don't like it. They are frantic in trying to meet the first real opposition they have faced.

The movement is not made up of selfish and cruel reactionaries who would grind down the poor to benefit the rich. Among them are irresponsible people who cloud the issue. We would consider Welch of the Birch Society such a person and harmful to the cause of conservatism. But he is but one of millions of Americans who have awakened to the danger of the leftwing radicals and Communist apologists who have long used the same tactics as Welch has used.

Wishing to see what was being said, and who was taking part in other groups organized to oppose communism, we attended such a group meeting. We were the oldest person in the room. The others were young business executives and civic workers. There were no intemperate statements. But there was an evident concern over the way freedom of men is being delegated to or usurped by Government. There was documented evidence presented to show how far the doctrines of communism have come to be accepted and how they have enslaved every country where they were not fought by the people. Reports tell of thousands of such groups in every section of the Nation.

There is a great problem faced by these people and groups. The Communist sympathizers and so-called liberals have long been free to spread their propaganda in condemning everyone who disagrees with them. No matter whether it is true or false, their

followers praise them. They are heroes to their groups of subversives. But the great mass of Americans are fundamentally honest and conservative. When a man like Welch refers to Eisenhower, Warren, and others as Communist tools, the mass of people turn away. They will not accept the demagog as a hero as do the leftwingers. But the danger is that these conservative Americans become apathetic defeatists and fail to accept their own responsibility to guide such groups in what is vital to safeguarding our freedoms.

The problem is how to awaken the people to the danger of constant appeasement of Communists or their pink followers. The danger is great and should be faced. It is a threat to our freedom as well as that of every other free country. We can freeze to death in a cold war as surely as we can be cooked to death in a hot war. We are facing the Communists with a poor armor. Our national decency and belief in honorable conduct is at a disadvantage when placed against an enemy that has no such scruples. But we can each stand up and be counted among those who are willing to fight against such subversive elements.

The groups over the Nation that have been formed to fight for freedom on the home front are being attacked by attempted ridicule. They are sneered at by those who have spent their adult lives sneering at the American way. But this present nationwide upsurge of Americanism and dedication to the system under which we live is the most hopeful sign seen in the last quarter century. It is late—but not too late to join in the movement to fight against the insidious propaganda and infiltration of Government, schools, churches, labor unions, and even business organizations by those who would change what we have for what is promised us by the Communists, or those who spread their philosophies and sneer at attempts to overcome the menace that faces this and all other free nations. If you do not like the way the fight is being carried out, get in and help guide it. But if you are realistic, you will not be neutral or apathetic.

Wishful Thinking Is Now Sound Financial Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for fiscal responsibility. The Kennedy administration puts great stress on the period of the business cycle theory, figuring that deficits now may be picked up later, if certain economic theories materialize. The trouble with that kind of planning is that the expected increases never catch up to spending. True fiscal responsibility means living within our income, cut Federal spending to what we take in each year. The best possible boost we could give the economy is to adopt legislation I have introduced, along with other Members, to make a constitutional provision that Government must live within its income. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune indicates some of the fuzzy economic thinking of administration officials:

A FORECAST OF OUR OWN

David E. Bell, the Kennedy Budget Director, told a conference of State budget of-

ficers that the administration was experimenting with 5-year budget forecasts in order to promote better planning. This is in line with Mr. Kennedy's notion that budgets will even out over the period of the business cycle, so that nobody need be greatly disturbed by the big deficits he has started out producing.

Mr. Bell said that had the parochial outlook prevailed of considering only the problems of the current fiscal year, a tax increase might have been deemed necessary. But, looking ahead to a few birds in the bush, he was hopeful that an additional \$10 billion a year in revenue might materialize. If so, the budget would be balanced.

We read into this that it will take \$10 billion more to offset the deficit registered for the last fiscal year and that which is in the making for the year to end June 30, 1962. And, on this basis, we think it possible to indulge in a few forecasts of our own, the chief one being that if Mr. Kennedy manages to hang on for 5 years, his annual budget at the end of that period at the present rate of increased spending will have reached a figure of about \$115 billion a year. And, things being so, Mr. Bell will still be scouring the horizon for another \$10 billion a year or so in the hope of making ends meet.

Operation Employment: Comment by the Journal of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a study group operating under the direction of the Republican policy committee's subcommittee on special projects has recently finished its study of "Employment in Our Dynamic Economy." The effort made and the product of this effort has elicited comment from a number of sources, one of these the respected Journal of Commerce of New York. In an editorial in its August 16 issue, the Journal commended the work of the group and commented on its recommendations. I should like to place this editorial from the Journal of Commerce in the RECORD to give its ideas on these matters the consideration of the readership of the RECORD:

EMPLOYING THE UNEMPLOYED

When a study group attached to a policy committee of a leading political party—in this case it's the GOP—comes up with some sensible recommendations that are not political and which refrain from damning the acts of the opposite party, it's news of the man-bites-dog type. After 6 months of study the group, headed by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, has come up with a report involving some 20 recommendations to aid unemployment.

Although the business recovery is daily providing more jobs, the fact that total unemployment remains so high a percentage of the labor force, with individual terms of unemployment gradually lengthening, is a cause of national disquiet, political criticism, and general viewings with alarm. Nearly everybody has felt that something ought to be done about it; nobody has been able to say just what should be done.

The study committee mentioned may crystallize into direction what has been a vague urge toward motion. It takes the

sensible view that with job vacancies so nearly approximating the number of jobless, what is primarily needed is retraining. More important, if retraining is the big need, there has to be an incentive for it right down the line. Forty States will have to change their rules to let unemployed persons stay on the unemployment compensation rolls while they are learning skills now needed or to be needed.

Tax changes must be made to permit workers to continue to get tax free per diem allowances past existing limitations when working away from their families. We are not sure this report said so, but union rules, pension plan regulations, and other limitations upon labor mobility also should be changed.

Employers, the committee said, should get some reward for running retraining schools for their own workers and possibly for other firms' workers. This could be through a broadening of the merit rating concept through which employers can lighten their unemployment tax burdens.

Workers should be able to deduct retraining expenses from their tax bills. There should be a national labor clearinghouse set up which would determine what skills should be concentrated upon in retraining; what part of the country needed or would need what skills.

There should be better coordination between national and State labor agencies, more accurate figures on the jobless rolls. There should even be teeth in regulations—for example, something to cut off from unemployment benefits anybody who refused to be retrained. There should be better vocational guidance in respect to those currently employed in the military services and who will eventually be added either to the rolls of the employed or the unemployed.

Today's unemployment is primarily structural, which means imbalance between types and geographical location of unemployed and types and location of jobs offered by employers. It is therefore eventually solvable and not something that is in the category of things that are to be indefinitely. It is complicated by distressed area unemployment, upon which, one of these days, we hope to comment.

At the moment the big thing is that a political committee has contributed something that will give purpose and determination to those who will have to live with the unemployment problem for years to come.

Reader's Digest Supports Cuban Refugee Emergency Appeal of the International Rescue Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the earliest and major contributors to the Cuban refugee relief program has been the well-known International Rescue Committee, Inc., with headquarters in New York.

The committee instituted its Caribbean program on July 13, 1960. Since that time, it has helped 20,000 Cuban refugees, some 12,000 in the Miami area and about 8,000 elsewhere, primarily New York, New Jersey, and southern Connecticut. One thousand four hundred were resettled from Miami, and more than

3,000 job opportunities were secured for refugees who turned to the committee for help. New registrations in Miami and New York average 250 a week, or almost 600 people if family members are included. Facing a caseload of 30,000 Cuban refugees by the end of the year, the committee is facing a grave financial crisis.

After the revolution in Hungary in 1956, more than 38,000 Hungarians entered this country. For this gigantic relief program, the committee received a total of \$3 million with which it aided in resettling these refugees from oppression.

I point out that by the end of this year, we expect to have received on our shores more than 150,000 refugees from Communist-infected Cuba—more than three times the number of Hungarians. The total program for the Cuban refugees relief program for the year 1960-61 was financed by the committee with \$350,000 raised by June 30 of this year. In comparison to the \$3 million donated for the Hungarians, this is a meager figure indeed for the existing program of relief and assistance. Not less than a million dollars is needed now for IRC's share of emergency assistance, a stepped-up resettlement program, and intensive retraining.

Of substantial help to the committee in its efforts has been an appeal made by the Reader's Digest Foundation, which solicited the financial support of its readers and contributed a check of \$10,000 to initiate a nationwide appeal. During this past month, an information program has been conducted throughout the country in support of the Reader's Digest appeal.

The International Rescue Committee brings 28 years of experience in aiding escapees from dictatorship. I trust all Americans will take an equal interest in its program of assistance so that it may effectively focus that experience on the needs of the 30,000 Cuban exiles in our midst and all those who will continue to find a haven here in our country from oppression and tyranny.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the

following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only

of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.